The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXI, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1949

CONTENTS

Communications to The American Ecclesiastical Review on the Occasion of its Sixtieth Anniversary 241

The University and the Review
Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick 257

The Sixtieth Birthday of The American Ecclesiastical Review
John Tracy Ellis 261

Herman J. Heuser: Founder of The American Ecclesiastical Review . . . . . *William J. Lallou* 281

Our Lady in The American Ecclesiastical Review
Lawrence P. Everett, C.SS.R. 286

The Spiritual Life of the Priest in The American Ecclesiastical Review . . . . *Kilian J. Healy, O.Carm.* 301

Dogmatic Theology in The American Ecclesiastical Review
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 312

Catechetics in the United States and The American Ecclesiastical Review . . . . *Joseph B. Collins, S.S.* 322

A Statement of Policy
Joseph Clifford Fenton 332

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930. under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The National Conference of Christians and Jews . . 341

Public References to the Rhythm 342

The Stole Placed on the Child in Baptism . . . 343

The Assistant Priest and the *Pax* 344

The Waxed Cloth on a Consecrated Altar 344

ANALECTA 345

BOOK REVIEWS

Liturgia Romana. *By Alexius Benigar, O.F.M.* . . . 350

The Lord is My Joy. *By Paul De Jaegher, S.J.* . . . 351

Liturgical Meditations. *By the Sisters of St. Dominic* . . 352

THE CARL MOSER CO.

cordially invites

The Reverend Clergy and Religious

to view

AN EXHIBITION OF OUTSTANDING VESTMENTS

at its showrooms

45 WEST FIFTY-FIRST STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

OCTOBER 1ST TO OCTOBER 29TH

This new and large collection just received from ST. GALL, SWITZERLAND, represents the sincere efforts of our artists for ever higher achievement in design and execution.

COMMUNICATIONS

TO

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

ON THE OCCASION OF ITS

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Mackay Radio

SUBSIDIARY OF
AMERICAN CABLE & RADIO CORPORATION
Largest American owned international telegraph system providing worldwide service by cable and radio.

TO TELEPHONE A MESSAGE
OR CALL A MESSENGER
AND
FOR CABLE AND RADIO
INFORMATION
CALL: ADams 9000

Commercial Cables

Mackay Radio

All America Cables and Radio

TO OBTAIN OUR FAST AND
ACCURATE SERVICE SENDER
MUST MARK MESSAGES
"Via Mackay Radio"

8 DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED "VIA MACKAY RADIO"

MK1148/VC71 VIA MACKAYRADIO

VATICANCITY 33 4 14 G

NLT FR JOSEPH FENTON

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY WASHINGTONDC

HOLY FATHER OCCASION SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY PUBLICATION AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW SENDS CORDIAL FELICITATIONS AND GLADLY IMPARTS EDITORIAL STAFF CONTRIBUTORS AND READERS HIS PATERNAL APOSTOLIC BLESSING

MONTINI SUBSTITUTE

CARDINAL'S OFFICE
225 N. 18TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

August 17, 1949

Rev. Dr. Joseph C. Fenton,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Doctor:

Because of your connection with the American Ecclesiastical Review, which is to celebrate next October its Sixtieth Anniversary, I beg to congratulate you and your co-workers on so auspicious a coming event.

When Father Heuser, of St. Charles' Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, founded that Review, he invited contributors to it from all over the world and took care to treat subjects of particular interest to our Reverend Clergy.

Accordingly, the Review became a storehouse of learned articles, covering particularly dogmatic and moral theology, canon law and Church history, as well as sacred liturgy. Its Editors have taken care from the beginning of the Review to carry out the tradition recommended from time immemorial by the Holy See, that is, "Sentire cum Ecclesia."

Among its contributors have been outstanding dogmatic and moral theologians, as well as Church historians.

In the days when modernism lifted its head and rationalism was rapidly spreading, your Review was a bulwark of orthodoxy; and, accordingly, was prized by the Reverend Clergy not only in this country, but also abroad.

It has since its existence been a sort of postgraduate study for our clergy and it is cited as an authority by modern authors in theology and canon law.

It is a pleasure to congratulate you and your co-workers and to wish you a continuation of the success, which you have achieved up to the present.

Very respectfully yours,

✠ D. CARD. DOUGHERTY,
Abp. of Phila.

Archdiocese of Detroit
Chancery Building
1234 Washington Boulevard
Detroit 26, Michigan

Archbishop's Office

September 14, 1949

Please accept my heartfelt congratulations on the sixtieth anniversary of the American Ecclesiastical Review.

Over the long span of years which this happy occasion recalls, the Review, through the devoted efforts of its editors and contributors, has rendered invaluable service to the Church in the United States. It has kept fresh in the minds of its readers the fundamentals of the Sacred Sciences learned in the Seminary. It has brought to the busy priest in parish work the results of research on the part of his brothers favored with time and talent for deeper study. It has stimulated and guided him in applying the principles of changeless truth to the new problems that arise in a changing world.

May the Review continue, on an ever widening scale, to be month after month an interesting, instructive and ofttimes inspiring visitor to the study of the alert priest.

✠ Edward Cardinal Mooney
Archbishop of Detroit

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE
452 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK 22

August 4, 1949

Dear Father Fenton:

I am pleased to learn that *The American Ecclesiastical Review* is about to begin its sixtieth year of publication and I wish therefore to take this occasion to congratulate you, the present Editors, and through you in retrospect all the editors and contributors to the magazine for the invaluable help that you have given the clergy these past six decades.

You are heirs to great traditions; and faithful to these traditions, you are nobly carrying forward responsibilities, publishing articles of note that are both informative and interesting.

Wishing you continued success in your endeavors, and praying for your efforts abundant fruits, I am

Very sincerely yours,

✠ F. CARDINAL SPELLMAN
Archbishop of New York

Reverend Joseph C. Fenton, D.D.
The American Ecclesiastical Review
Washington 17, D. C.

Apostolic Delegation
United States of America
3339 Massachusetts Avenue
Washington 8, D. C.

October 1, 1949

Reverend Joseph C. Fenton
Editor
The American Ecclesiastical Review
Washington, D. C.

Reverend and dear Father:

On this memorable occasion of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the American Ecclesiastical Review I join with the Holy Father, the Hierarchy and clergy of the United States in congratulating the Editorial Staff and the other priests and laymen who have contributed to the success of this outstanding Catholic publication for the clergy.

In the past six decades the Review has furnished busy parish priests with scholarly studies of questions in the fields of dogma, moral and liturgy and has encouraged and promoted interest in and understanding of the religious issues of the day. The American Ecclesiastical Review has rendered a valuable service to the clergy of this country and merits great praise and commendation. While recalling the memory of the scholars who contributed to the pages of this magazine in the past I heartily congratulate those zealous priests whose articles still add prestige to the Review.

To the American Ecclesiastical Review I wish a future as glorious as its past and to its editors and contributors I wish every possible grace and blessing.

With sentiments of esteem and highest personal regard, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

✠ A. G. Cicognani
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate

Archbishop's House
5870 Belmont Avenue
Cincinnati 24, Ohio

September 13, 1949

Reverend and dear Dr. Fenton:

I offer my cordial congratulations to "The American Ecclesiastical Review" on the occasion of its sixtieth anniversary. Perhaps the fifty years of intimate contact that I have had with "The Review," its founder, who so ably edited "The Review" for many years; and its subsequent editors—Bishop Turner, Monsignor Kerby, and yourself—give me a special reason for rejoicing.

I have before me several issues of "The Pastor," the first number of which appeared in November, 1882, with Father W. J. Wiseman as its editor. When this meritorious periodical was discontinued it seemed the United States was not yet prepared for an ecclesiastical publication to serve the clergy.

The magnificent imagination, the resourcefulness, the courage, and the supreme confidence in God necessary to carry on such a work were found in a young priest who had come to our country, knowing little of our language. He had been prepared for the priesthood in the Philadelphia Seminary and ordained for that diocese.

The story of "The Review," its trials, its reverses, its notable achievements through its founder—Father Herman J. Heuser—can prove to be one of the most interesting pages of our American Church history. It is to be regretted that Mr. Edward J. Galbally, who was associated with Father Heuser for perhaps half a century, did not develop his tribute of Father Heuser appearing in "The Ecclesiastical Review," October, 1933, into a life of the founder. Such a biography was frequently suggested.

During many years I visited Father Heuser, even after his retirement from active teaching. These visits were always an inspiration to me.

I will merely indicate some topics that might be put on the agenda for historical research. Mr. Galbally's article in "The Review" furnishes many items that could be developed. I venture to indicate these topics in the conviction that, if our biographical

papers and ecclesiastical history were written with more frankness and intriguing realism, our American Church history would arouse greater interest and would enable us to know, as they were, the pioneers, the great-hearted and noble-minded priests and prelates of our country who labored for souls and for our nation.

The first appearance of "The Review" in January, 1889—the circumstances of its appearance and the collaborators of Father Heuser—the collaboration of Mr. Edward J. Galbally and of Father Francis P. Siegfried—the discerning judgment of Monsignor Corcoran, recognizing in the seminarian Herman J. Heuser exceptional ability that was not generally perceived—the opposition of the clergy in certain sections to "The Review" —the false impression that Father Heuser was not favorable to American priests as writers (the fact, which I know personally, is that the founder was most anxious to cultivate writers among our American priests)—the friendly attitude of Archbishop Ryan toward "The Review," especially after a visit to Europe where he was congratulated on all sides because of the publication of "The Ecclesiastical Review" in his diocese—the high esteem in which Father Heuser was held by Archbishop Prendergast—the fifty years of Father Heuser's professorship in Overbrook Seminary—Archbishop Corrigan's interest in "The Review"—Father Heuser's visit to Ireland, the encouragement that he gave Canon Sheehan and the first installment of "My New Curate," in "The Review" of May, 1898—the principal works of Father Heuser—the favorable change in attitude of Father Heuser toward the Maryknoll Society—publication of letters written by Maryknoll Missioners in the field to "The Review" was suggested by this writer after consultation with Bishop James Anthony Walsh—the first of these letters appeared in the issue of March, 1919, and they were continued in subsequent issues—the conference of the selected editors of the "New York Review" with Father Heuser before their publication was issued—the generous and noble position of Father Heuser in his suppression of "The Dolphin"—Father Heuser's unwillingness to go into competition (when he found others doing a work he considered it a duty to give encouragement; with his fertile imagination and resourcefulness, he always felt that

there was more work to be done for the Church than he could do, without covering a field occupied or to be occupied by others—the strong conviction of Father Heuser that his "Review" should serve the priests of America in the best possible manner—his constant insistence that profits of "The Review" should be given away in charity—the visit of His Eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, to view the remains of Father Heuser in Saint Charles' Seminary, and perhaps His Eminence's surprise at seeing the dead priest clothed in the simple white habit of the Third Order of Saint Dominic. For years there was a mystery box in Father Heuser's room, to be opened only at his death. Years previous to his demise Father Heuser told me the secret of the box, saying it contained the habit in which he wished to be buried.

Over the past sixty years "The Ecclesiastical Review" has rendered a marvelous service to the priests of this country. It is an invaluable aid to the American clergy today. The interest of our clergy in its learned articles is an indication of the more serious interest of our priests in scholarship.

With every best wish, I am

Faithfully yours in Christ,

✠ John T. McNicholas
Archbishop of Cincinnati

The Reverend Dr. Joseph C. Fenton
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

2101 Commonwealth Avenue
Brighton 35, Mass.

August 3, 1949

Rev. Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D., Editor
The American Ecclesiastical Review
620 Michigan Avenue, N.E.,
Washington 17, D. C.

Dear Doctor Fenton,

Let me join the host of those who will be sending the Ecclesiastical Review congratulations on its Jubilee. As American publications go—indeed, as *any* publications go in this changing world—the Review is a venerable institution with traditions of scholarship which bring us far back into Catholic history in the United States. But the Review has always kept, as it manifests today, a truly youthful vitality and vision. It sounds the clear, ancient note of Catholic orthodoxy, but it does so with a contemporary ring. *Non nova sed nove:* this has been the watchword of the Ecclesiastical Review and certainly it is one which should be characteristic of a theological journal published by and for priests.

I add my best wishes to those of all the friends of the Review and I join in the many prayers which will be prompted by your Jubilee, prayers that God, the Author of all truth, will continue to bless your apostolate through happy years to come as He has done through the glorious years which are now history.

Faithfully yours in Christ

✠ Richard J. Cushing
Archbishop of Boston

Archbishop's Residence
619 Tenth Street, Northwest
Washington 1, D. C.

July 30, 1949

Reverend Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D.
Editor
The Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

Dear Dr. Fenton:

May I express my enthusiastic congratulations to you and your staff on the sixtieth anniversary of the Ecclesiastical Review.

Across more than half a momentous century, the Review has marked the ebb and flow of the tide of human thought where it has washed against the firm rock of the Church, from the fraudulent Liberalism of the last century, through Modernism, and to the Communism of the present hour. It has carried the messages of great Popes to the Catholic world in the crucial years of harsh struggles of the Church, and thereby made our priesthood profoundly aware of the needs which the passing times create, and for which the Church has the authentic answer with assurance of divine support in enlightening the world.

So many memorable names have been associated with this long and fruitful history of sixty years, beginning with the self-sacrificing Father Heuser laboring for the first forty years, followed by the scholarly and priestly Monsignor Kerby. The list of names in the Index over the years reveals a mighty array of the battalions of Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, learned priests and laymen, eminent scientists, philosophers, and theologians, men armed with the hammer of a mighty mind and the sword of the Spirit of God: all dedicated to the holy purpose of promoting knowledge and love for Holy Mother Church, and by the same token for Christ our Lord.

There are indeed many lights that illumine men walking to-

wards the City of God. The Review certainly is not the least of these. And, therefore, I pray God that under your own admirable and scholarly direction, the Review will extend in the future the enlightenment which its leaders have always prayerfully sought, motivated by the deep desire that men may know God and their fellowman the better, for their closer identification with the mind and the teaching of the Church.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

✠ Patrick A. O'Boyle
Archbishop of Washington

Bishop's House
68 Elliot Street
Springfield, Massachusetts

Dear Father Fenton:

Thank you for informing me about the Review's sixtieth anniversary number. I believe that this magazine has been, since its inception, a strong force for good among the priests of the United States. Through the years it has carried a tremendous amount of instructive and edifying material. It has, moreover, stressed from its earliest days that profound love for the Church which His Holiness urged so powerfully in his epochal encyclical, the Mystici Corporis.

I have read The American Ecclesiastical Review since its early years, when Fr. Heuser was still directing it and writing for it. He and his collaborators contributed much, and those who have followed him in his work have contributed much, to the cause of Christ in America.

I congratulate the Review on this its sixtieth anniversary, and I hope and pray that it may long labor for Our Lord.

With kindest regards to you and to your staff, I remain, Father,

Sincerely in Christ

✠ Thomas M. O'Leary
Bishop of Springfield

Aug. 9, 1949

The editor and his associates are deeply grateful for the blessing of Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, upon the work of The American Ecclesiastical Review. *They wish to express their appreciation also for the gracious encouragement manifested by His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty; His Eminence Edward Cardinal Mooney; His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman; The Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, D.D.; The Most Reverend Archbishop John T. McNicholas, O.P., S.T.M.; The Most Reverend Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, D.D., LL.D.; The Most Reverend Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D.; and The Most Reverend Bishop Thomas M. O'Leary, D.D. With the help of Our Divine Lord and the intercession of Our Lady, they humbly purpose to conserve, as best lies in their power, the tradition of service to the priests of America which is the legacy from their predecessors in the work of the* Review.

Ἑν ἐνὶ πνεύματι,

μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες

τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE REVIEW

The American Ecclesiastical Review and The Catholic University of America came into existence the same year, 1889. Although sixty years is a short period in the history of a university, it is a long one in the history of a periodical or review. The close association which has existed between the University and the *Review* dates from their earliest years. The Rev. Dr. Herman J. Heuser, founder and first editor of the *Review*, was deeply interested in the newly established University and generously opened the pages of the *Review* for articles pertaining to it. Among the first items printed was the complete text of the letter of Pope Leo XIII, *Magni Nobis gaudii*, really the papal charter authorizing the establishment of the University, which appeared in June, 1889. It was in response to Dr. Heuser's invitation that Bishop John J. Keane, first Rector, contributed the article on "The Clergy and The Catholic University" for the July number. This was at once a strong appeal to the priests of the country for their support of the University and at the same time an expression of his hopes of what would be accomplished by the University for the higher education of the clergy. As a reflection of the interest of the editor in the new institution, Bishop Keane concluded the article with the remark: "Thus I have thrown out a few suggestive ideas, confidently leaving their development to the Editor of the *Ecclesiastical Review*."

In the August number, 1889, there appeared an article on "The Present Aspect of The Catholic University," by the Rev. Dr. P. J. Garrigan, Vice Rector, who also contributed an article in the September issue on "The First Lustrum of The Catholic University." The last issue of the year, containing the November and December numbers, included an article on "The Divinity Building of the Washington University" illustrated with plans of the first and second stories of the building. Thus in the first year of publication there were five articles dealing with the Catholic University.

In the years immediately following, we find occasional articles dealing with the University, and a large number of contributions from the staff. In 1891, for example, a series of articles entitled "Theological Minimizing and its Latest Defender" was contributed by Dr. J. Schroeder, Professor of Theology at the University. These were in answer to Canon Bartolo's *I criteri theologici*, pub-

lished at Torino in 1888. The series ran for four months and was discontinued when Canon Bartolo submitted to the condemnation of his views by the Holy See. In that same year began the series of articles by Rev. John B. Hogan, SS., of the University, which later were published in book form as *Clerical Studies.*

That same year, 1891, saw the appearance of the first article by Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shahan, entitled, "A Disciple of De Rossi." One may note that the February issue of 1892 contained five articles in opposition to Dr. Bouquillon's stand on the school question; the second of these articles "The Right of Instruction" was written by Rev. Dr. Sebastian Messmer, then a professor at the University, later Bishop of Green Bay and Archbishop of Milwaukee. Amid a long list of contributors from the staff of the University and its affiliated colleges, we note the names of the Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, C.S.P., the Rev. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., of St. Paul's College, and the Rev. Hugh T. Henry of Overbrook Seminary and later of Catholic University, who was one of the most prolific contributors to the *Review.* From 1904 onward, we find the familiar names of Rev. Dr. John A. Ryan, Rev. Dr. William Turner, Rev. Dr. Paschal Robinson, Rev. Dr. John M. Cooper, and Rev. Dr. William J. Kerby. Scarcely a volume of the *Review* appeared without a contribution from some one at the University.

A second phase of the close relationship between the University and the *Review* is indicated by the number of editors supplied by the University. Dr. Heuser, the founder of the *Review,* was its editor from the beginning until 1914, when because of illness he was obliged to relinquish the office. He chose the Rev. Dr. William Turner, then Professor of Philosophy at the University, to be his successor, and according to his biographer never regretted the choice. Dr. Turner acted as editor until his appointment as Bishop of Buffalo in 1919. Dr. Heuser then resumed the editorship, looking meanwhile for a successor to Bishop Turner. He approached Rev. Dr. William J. Kerby, Professor of Sociology at the University, a well-known contributor to the *Review,* and offered him the position, but Dr. Kerby asked for a deferment until he could be free from other obligations to accept. This he did in 1927. Dr. Kerby held the office until his death in 1936. He was succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Joseph A. LaRue, Procurator of the University,

who was editor until the *Review* passed into the control of the University.

Dr. Heuser as far back as 1927 had chosen a Board of Trustees for the *Review* with the explicit purpose of holding it for ultimate transfer to the Catholic University. The Board included as its original members Bishop McDevitt of Harrisburg, Chairman; Bishop Shahan, Rector of the University; Bishop Turner of Buffalo; Msgr. James P. Turner of Philadelphia; and Msgr. Pace, Vice Rector of the University. In the course of years, due to vacancies caused by death, Bishop O'Boyle of Pittsburgh, Bishop Fitzmaurice of Wilmington, Bishop Leech of Harrisburg, and Bishop Ireton of Richmond served as members. When Dr. Heuser died in 1933, Dr. Kerby was still editor. Fr. LaRue discharged the duties of editor until December, 1943, when negotiations were begun for the transfer of the *Review* to the University. This proved to be a rather lengthy proceeding which was not actually completed until the legal dissolution of the Board of Trustees in 1947. Shortly after Fr. LaRue's withdrawal from the University to accept appointment as Pastor of St. Barnabas' Church in Philadelphia, a new editorial staff was set up by the University (January, 1944), with Rev. Dr. Joseph C. Fenton as Editor-in-chief, Rev. Dr. Edmond D. Benard, Assistant Editor, and Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Rev. Dr. Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., and Rev. Dr. Thomas O. Martin, members of the staff.

The office of the *Review,* which had been from the beginning located in Philadelphia, was moved in 1943 to the University and the business of publication was taken over by The Catholic University of America Press, whose manager, the Rev. Dr. James A. Magner, Procurator of the University, has shared responsibility and credit with the editorial staff for the improvement in format and in circulation which has characterized the *Review* in recent years. The close relationship which has existed between the University and the *Review* from the year of their establishment has now culminated in an arrangement which the founder and first editor, Dr. Heuser, had hoped to be achieved in order that there would be assured the continuation of a work for the cultural and

spiritual welfare of clergy to which he gave the best efforts of his scholarly life.

RT. REV. MSGR. PATRICK J. MCCORMICK
Rector,
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE PASTOR SPEAKS TO HIS BOOKS

"For forty years you have been my companions in solitude; to you I owe whatever inspirations I have ever felt; from you have descended in copious streams the ideas that raised my poor life above the commonplace, and the sentiments that have animated every good thing and every holy purpose that I have accomplished. Friends that never obtruded on my loneliness by idle chatter and gossip, but always spoke wise, inspiring things when most I needed them; friends that never replied in irritation to my own disturbed imaginings, but always uttered your calm wisdom like voices from eternity, to soothe, to control or to elevate; friends that never tired and never complained; that went back to your recesses without a murmur; and never resented by stubborn silence my neglect—treasures of thought and fountains of inspiration, you are the last things on earth on which my eyes shall rest in love, and like the orphans of my flock your future shall be my care. True, like your authors, you look sometimes disreputable enough. Your clothes, more to my shame, hang loose and tattered around you, and some of your faces are ink-stained or thumb-worn from contact with the years and my own carelessness. I would dress you in purple and fine linen if I may, yet you would reproach me and think I was weary of your homely faces. . . . So shall it be! but between you and me there must be no divorce, so long as time shall last for me. Other friends will come and go, but nothing shall dissolve our union based upon gratitude and such love as man's heart may have for the ideal and insensible."

—Canon Sheehan, "My New Curate," *AER*, XVIII, 6 (June, 1898), 630.

MISSION INTENTION

"The greater spread of Mission News by the Press" is the Mission Intention for the month of October, 1949.

THE SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY OF THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

"Not to know what happened before one was born, is always to remain a child." There are few men who have experienced the enriching influence of history in their lives who would quarrel with this judgment attributed to Cicero. Formerly we used to think of history in terms of nations, political institutions, and wars, but of late years that narrow attitude has been greatly expanded, with the result that today virtually all man's activities fall within the scope of the historian and in this broadened concept no division of human effort has deservedly received more attention than cultural history. As Toynbee has said, if the argument of the opening chapter of his magisterial work is accepted, "it will be agreed that the intelligible unit of historical study is neither a nation state nor (at the other end of the scale) mankind as a whole but a certain grouping of humanity which we have called a society." [1] In any consideration of the past of a modern society wherein it has operated the thought of the Catholic Church is a factor of paramount importance. In attempting to discover something of what that thought was the historian cannot do better than to turn to the approved media of Catholic expression as a guide to the ideas of the leading men of the Church as they unfolded them for their generation. In the realm of American Catholic thought *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has occupied for over sixty years a position of first-rate importance in reflecting opinion among the clergy and in tracing the movements through which the American Church has passed since the closing years of the nineteenth century. There is, therefore, much to be learned from a perusal of its pages. Here the church historian will find real assistance in his efforts to seek out the theological and literary patterns of clerical thought, while the theologian, the canon lawyer, and the general student of American culture will discover that in many instances this journal was a faithful reflector of the mind of the Church on the leading questions of these years.

It was sixty years ago last January that Fr. Herman J. Heuser, professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Charles Borromeo Seminary,

[1] Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History* (New York, 1947), p. 11, abridged edition.

Philadelphia, summoned the courage to launch practically single-handed the publication of a monthly journal for the clergy. For this new venture Heuser was able to draw on the experience which he had gained as assistant editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* where for some years he served under the expert guidance of Msgr. James A. Corcoran. The story of his achievements has never been told in full, although two months after his death on August 22, 1933, an account of Heuser's early struggles was given by Edward J. Galbally in the issue of October, and Hugh T. Henry added his memories of Heuser as editor of the *Review* to the record in the number of January, 1939. In the inaugural issue of his monthly journal in January, 1889—which was but forty pages in length—Heuser wrote a hortatory article which he called "Literature and the Clergy" in which he made a plea to the American priests that they should be and always remain men of books. "The guardians divinely commissioned of the faith," said Heuser, "are the priesthood. It is plain, then, that the latter has a duty in the field of literature" (p. 2). It was in this form that Heuser made his apologia for the enterprise he had just begun, and the success which attended his efforts can be gauged to some extent from the fact that the journal which he founded sixty years ago with such meager support and slender resources had by July, 1949, entered upon its 121st volume of unbroken publication and from the insignificant list of those who upheld Heuser's hand in the early days of 1889 the list of subscribers has grown until today there are 5,400 priests and religious scattered throughout the length and breadth of the United States and in over thirty foreign countries who receive the *Review*.

There was a real need at the time for a journal of this type. True, the *Ave Maria* and the *Catholic World* had both begun publication in 1865, but their aims were not so largely directed to priests as was the case with the new journal, and the *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* which had first appeared in 1876, had always addressed itself to the general Catholic reading public. The new *Review,* on the other hand, specialized in articles of particular interest to the clergy in the fields of theology, canon law, church history, and literature. Its contents likewise featured the texts of documents from the Holy See touching on the American Church, vexing moral cases to which suggested solutions were offered, conferences

or short topics on a variety of subjects, an increasing quota of reviews of new books, and for a time during the 1890's homiletic outlines were also provided for use on the Sundays and holy days of the season.

For the first quarter century Dr. Heuser continued to edit the journal, but with the issue of July, 1914, the editorship passed into the hands of William Turner, professor of philosophy in The Catholic University of America, who held it until he was named Bishop of Buffalo in the early days of 1919. Heuser then resumed the post and continued as editor until the issue of July, 1927, when he surrendered it for good to William J. Kerby, professor of sociology in The Catholic University of America, who kept it until his death on July 27, 1936. In the issue of September, 1936, John J. Burke, C.S.P., wrote a tribute to Msgr. Kerby who probably more than any other of the past editors except Heuser himself had identified his name with the *Review* in the minds of the American clergy. From 1936 until 1944 the monthly was edited by Joseph N. LaRue, pastor of St. Barnabas Church in Philadelphia, and with the issue of January, 1944, the present editor, Joseph C. Fenton, associate professor of dogmatic theology in The Catholic University of America, assumed charge. With the assistance of a group of his colleagues in the School of Theology of the University, Fr. Fenton has carried on the fine traditions of the *Review* to the present time, and to them we extend our hearty congratulations on the present anniversary and wish for them every success through the days to come.

To scan the table of contents of this monthly journal through the volumes of the last sixty years is, in many ways, to call the roll of the great names in the priesthood of our own country and foreign lands. In the days before Modernism had taken its sad toll, Alfred Loisy and George Tyrrell wrote frequently for the *Review*. We find, for example, that in May, 1896, Loisy contributed an article on "The Scriptural Account of the Two Disciples of Emmaus," a second on "The Transfiguration of Our Lord," in August, 1897, and in March, 1898, a third article entitled "Gethsemane." In the closing days of the old century Tyrrell sent a manuscript which appeared in December, 1899, under the title "True and False Mysticism." Among other writers of the old world who were then prominent, one finds such names as Canon Sheehan of Ireland, of

whom we shall speak later, and Vincent McNabb, O.P., Herbert Thurston, S.J., and Hugh Pope, O.P., of England. Another distinguished English priest appeared in the *Review* in March, 1906, when Robert Hugh Benson addressed himself to the subject of "The Conversion of England." Benson believed that Catholics were too complacent about the position of their Church, too ready to accept the *status quo,* and not bold enough in their efforts to propagate the Faith. The means he would use would be prayer and example, both of which he considered obvious, but to these he added that of religious controversy. However, Benson was at pains to make it clear that he did not mean to encourage frontal attacks upon the religious beliefs of those outside the Church and he pleaded with priests who were endeavoring to make converts that they should show an understanding of the position of those whom they made the objects of their zeal. Above all, the distinguished English convert begged his fellow priests not to be patronizing in their approach to prospective converts and to remember that every potential convert was a different person with his or her own individuality and personality. During the year 1897 the Italian clergy had a representative writer in the *Review* in the person of Salvatore M. Brandi, S.J., of the editorial staff of *Civiltà Cattolica,* who wrote a series of articles on Leo XIII and Anglican orders, and among French names we find that of Pierre Batiffol, Rector of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, whose writings were used by the editor in March, 1907, to set before American readers some of the acute problems then facing the French clergy after the separation of Church and State in France.

But if well-known names from among the Catholic clergy of Europe appeared regularly in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the majority of its writers were, as was to be expected, priests of the United States. In the earlier years the two learned Sulpicians, Francis E. Gigot and Joseph Bruneau, wrote from time to time for the journal on scriptural subjects, and after 1914, due likely to Turner's influence as editor, the professors of The Catholic University of America came into greater prominence in its pages. For example, in these numbers one finds Patrick J. Healy writing on papal biography, John O'Grady on the religious element in the labor problems of the Middle Ages, and John M. Cooper on the higher culture of early man. The first contribution of a long list

of articles sent to the *Review* by Peter Guilday appeared in April, 1915, when he discussed under the title, "The New Manual of Church History," the features which he believed should characterize a good textbook in church history.

All through the years the *Review* carried series of articles on various subjects of interest to the American clergy. One of the longest, which later appeared in book form, was that which opened in May, 1891, on the general subject of "Clerical Studies" by John B. Hogan, S.S. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., and Joseph Wissel, C.SS.R., joined with several others three years later for a series in August-September, 1894, on the parish mission, and in the following year a new series was begun on what books should be in the priest's library. In this series there were among others Bishop John Lancaster Spalding who wrote on books in education, Austin Dowling of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, on church history, and William Poland, S.J., of St. Louis University, on books in philosophy. Likewise during 1895 the *Review* ran a series by different contributors on the best means of furthering the temperance movement and extending its good results. In 1896 and 1897 a large share of space was taken up with the subject of clerical education when Bishop Camillus P. Maes of Covington contributed three articles beginning in March, 1896, and during 1897 there followed a lengthy series on American seminaries, of which probably the most memorable article was that of Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid in May on St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester.

The interest which the editor of the *Review* had in the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was reflected all through this period. In August, 1890, the report of the society for the year 1889 was carried and it must have given slight consolation to American Catholics to learn that the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the West Indies taken together had contributed a total of only 248,381 francs while Alsace-Lorraine alone had given 279,809 francs. The grand total for the entire world was in that year over four million francs of which France had provided nearly two-thirds (p. 153). In an effort to stir American Catholic generosity for this cause the *Review* published an article by James A. Walsh in January, 1904, in which the co-founder of Maryknoll told of the forward work for the missions being done in the Archdiocese of Boston, and two and a half years later another Boston priest,

Joseph V. Tracy, published in July, 1906, the report which he had made the previous April to the archbishops' annual conference on the over-all aspects of the mission movement in the United States. As a fitting climax to this interest in the missions of the early century there opened in the issue of March, 1919, a series called "Maryknoll Mission Letters." The first of a lengthy collection of letters to be published in the *Review* was one from the present Bishop Francis X. Ford, M.M., under date of Sept. 26, 1918, written on board ship about two thousand miles southwest of San Francisco on his way to China in the company of Thomas F. Price, the present Bishop James E. Walsh, and Bernard F. Meyer. These four men were the pioneer Maryknollers in China who had left the United States three weeks before Fr. Ford's letter was signed. The Maryknoll series ran for many months and it doubtless did much to enliven the interest of the American clergy in the great cause which Maryknoll has represented so splendidly during the past thirty years.

One of the most interesting serial publications in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* was that of two novels of Canon P. A. Sheehan. *My New Curate* began in May, 1898, and ran through many issues while ten years later in the November, 1908, number there began the same author's *Blindness of Doctor Gray*. These immensely popular novels of clerical life attracted a great deal of attention to the *Review* on the part of the American clergy and they provided material as well for public reading in a number of seminaries which served, in turn, to introduce future priests to the journal. The month following the opening of *My New Curate* its author published an article in the *Review* which he called "Catholic Literary Criticism" (June, 1898) in which he stated that a man must have two essential qualities for the task of literary criticism, namely, competent knowledge and liberality of mind. It was Sheehan's view that the first principle for commendation of a Catholic book should be the direct contradictory of the old scholastic maxim, "Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocunque defectu." This the Irish canon pronounced a perfectly healthy axiom in moral science, but he termed it, "a vicious and pernicious maxim in criticism" (p. 595). It is pleasant to recall that it was Fr. Heuser who gave to us, five years after the canon's death, the first competent biog-

raphy of this interesting Irish priest in his *Canon Sheehan of Doneraile* (New York, 1918).

In general the *Review* revealed through its early years a conservative tone in the discussion of the moral aspects of current problems. In February, 1894, L. W. Reilly of Hanoverville, Maryland, provoked a somewhat heated debate with his highly critical article on "The Weak Points of Our Catholic Press." Reilly listed what were in his judgment the chief weaknesses characterizing the Catholic papers of that period as follows: lack of standing, poverty, want of competent editors, vagaries, and partisanship in politics. "The Church," said Reilly, "is not Democratic with a big D, but a majority of the Catholic papers are" (p. 122). Moreover, to Reilly there was no solidarity among Catholic editors and no harmony of opinion, to which he added that a final weakness in his mind was the improper use which certain Catholic newspapers made of advertisements.

Three months later in the issue of May, 1894, the *Review* threw open its columns for replies. Condé B. Pallen, editor of the *Church Progress* of St. Louis, gave it as his opinion that the failure of the Catholic papers to make a better showing was due in good measure to the fact that they were so firmly tied to the cartwheels of the secular press that they had lost their independence. The secular papers had conditioned the minds of Catholic readers and the Catholic editors simply went along. Certainly, thought Pallen, the Catholic newspaper must never be independent of the obedience due to the bishop in whose diocese it was published, and in conclusion the St. Louis editor, who figured prominently in some of the most sensational "leaks" of confidential communications of the hierarchy in the late 1890's, said, "To the hierarchy in general and the clergy he [the editor] owes a loyal deference and respect" (p. 341). It was a fine sentiment, but there were doubtless some American prelates at the time who must have wished that Mr. Pallen had practised more strictly the principle which he stoutly proclaimed in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* John Talbot Smith, former editor of the *Catholic Review* of New York, wrote in the same issue on "Partisan Politics in the Catholic Press," a fact which he admitted and deplored and which he illustrated by the comment that no Catholic Republican could read the Boston *Pilot* with what he termed "equanimity and pleasure" (p. 344). But to Smith it did not seem

that there was much ground for optimism, regardless of the politics of the Catholic editors, since he said, "As a rule Catholics do not read the Catholic weeklies, even where they subscribe for them" (p. 343).

Among the others whose opinions were given on this subject was Maurice Francis Egan, former editor of the *Freeman's Journal* of New York, who felt that no Catholic paper of which he had knowledge had been killed through the undue influence or neglect of a bishop but rather by the lack of capital and good business management. While he was not as pessimistic as Reilly had been three months before, he doubted if a Catholic weekly of the caliber of *The Independent* of New York would succeed, but he added that given the purposes at which their editors aimed there were no better papers than Pallen's *Church Progress* and Humphrey J. Desmond's *Catholic Citizen* of Milwaukee. An article by the editor, Fr. Heuser, on "The Catholic Press and Episcopal Authority" furnished some salutary reminders of what constituted and what did not constitute episcopal approval of Catholic newspapers, and for the benefit of those who might think he had exaggerated the faults of the Catholic press he said, "Of the large number of Catholic exchanges received by us there are several that we would not allow to be read by respectable non-Catholics or young persons, from a legitimate fear of injuring the Catholic name or weakening the Catholic faith" (p. 368). Eight years later Heuser again castigated some of the Catholic newspapers for the way in which they handled the question of the friars' lands in the Philippines. He was especially severe in this article of September, 1902, on the Catholic editors who had criticized the United States government after the Holy See had expressed itself as so well satisfied with the conduct of our government over the friars' lands case. Heuser believed that the acceptance of false reports as facts, the undue zeal, and the bad logic of certain Catholic editors had led them to draw rash conclusions in favor of the friars and against the United States. In this contribution, which Heuser called "Catholic Journalism and the Friar Question," he assigned as part of the explanation why the German Catholic newspapers in particular had been so critical of the United States the fact that these publications were in large measure conducted with the active assistance of religious-order men.

One of the most pressing problems of the late nineteenth century

for American churchmen—far more acute than the Catholic press—was that of Catholic membership in secret societies. It was a matter on which the hierarchy was sharply divided as to a solution.[2] While the *Review* did not take what one might call a formal editorial stand, the fact that it published early in 1892 two articles favoring condemnation of the societies made it clear that it was aligned with the conservatives and was not in favor of temporizing with the lodges. In April the Archbishop of Milwaukee, Frederick X. Katzer, published his "Societies Forbidden in the Church," which was followed in June by the article of Archbishop Francis Janssens of New Orleans on "The Knights of Pythias." The rather rigorous attitude of the two archbishops was clearly in favor of condemnation and gave further evidence that the *Review's* position was that of the *tutior pars* in questions of this kind.

Although the secret societies continued to concern the bishops for many years they never occupied the central position in the minds of the American prelates that was true of a subject like Catholic education. It was only natural that Catholic education should find a prominent place in the pages of a journal addressed principally to priests and in this the *Review* did not disappoint its readers. At the very time that the hierarchy was agitated over secret societies the problem of the Catholic parochial school arose in a very acute form. The origins of the controversy were traced to the speech of Archbishop Ireland before the National Education Association in St. Paul in July, 1890, in which his opponents felt he had been much too generous with the American public schools, while a second factor was the arrangement brought about by Ireland in two of his parish schools for the local public school boards to take over these parochial schools and operate them under their own system.[3] The discussion of the school question opened in the *Review* in October, 1890, in a very mild and conciliatory manner with an unsigned article entitled "Reflections of a Priest on the School Question." The author strongly deprecated the harsh language em-

[2] On the subject of secret societies cf. Fergus Macdonald, C.P., *The Catholic Church and the Secret Societies in the United States* (New York, 1946), and for a definitive treatment of one society suspected at the time by some of the bishops cf. Henry J. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington, 1949).

[3] Cf. Daniel F. Reilly, O.P., *The School Controversy, 1891-1893* (Washington, 1943).

ployed by some Catholics toward the public schools and after weighing the merits and demerits of both the parochial and public schools he concluded, "The most effective way to awaken the American people to a just sense of our claims is to allow the two systems to work out their comparative results" (p. 284). But it was not long before the language of conciliation on the schools disappeared from the pages of the *Review,* and in the issue of February, 1892, the monthly joined the conservative side with a series of articles heavily loaded against Archbishop Ireland and his school plan at Faribault and Stillwater, Minnesota. Among the contributors on this occasion were Francis S. Chatard, Bishop of Vincennes, and Sebastian G. Messmer, professor of canon law in The Catholic University of America, who within a few weeks was to be consecrated as fourth Bishop of Green Bay. Both Chatard and Messmer were thoroughly opposed to Ireland's ideas, and the other writers in this issue were for the most part in agreement with them. The following month brought a second article from Messmer on the school question when he was joined by Fr. Dennis T. O'Sullivan, S.J., of Woodstock College. The discussion continued all through the year and as late as October, 1892, the *Review* carried a vigorous attack from a California layman, Zachary Montgomery, who wrote on the "Contemplated Educational Alliance between Church and State."

Needless to say these articles in the *Review* proved highly distasteful to the sympathizers of Archbishop Ireland. The fact that the journal did take sides indicated the strong feelings on the question of Archbishop Patrick J. Ryan of Philadelphia in whose see city it was published. Shortly before the storm broke in its full fury, Ryan had told Cardinal Gibbons that he would hold the *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* also published in Philadelphia, to principles and not let it touch the controversy as such.[4] But as the fight wore on, Ryan apparently dropped his reserve, since it is obvious that he could have exercised, had he chosen to do so, the same restraining influence over *The American Ecclesiastical Review* as he did over the *Quarterly.* Actually the *Review* appeared to some of Ireland's friends as so formidable an adversary that Gibbons told the archbishop after he had seen the issue of February, 1892, that he wished the journal had received a crushing

[4] Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 89-F-6, Ryan to Gibbons, Philadelphia, Dec. 23, 1891.

rebuke from the Holy See. "It has become," said the cardinal, "a bitter partisan in the education question." [5] About three weeks later Abbé Alphonse Magnien, S.S., of Baltimore, in reporting matters to Archbishop Ireland who was then in Rome, spoke of the opposition of the Roman Jesuit journal, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, and the strength which it was giving to the enemies of Ireland in the United States. Magnien stated:

> It is the American Ecclesiastical Review of Philadelphia which is now the organ of your opponents & of those of the University. . . . Would it not be proper to have Card. Rampolla[6] dropping a note to Archbishop Ryan, under whose auspices that review is published, to tell him that it is, to say the least, very disrespectful to the Holy Father, thus to speak of his official organ in connection with an article revised by him & published by his order? Rome has written for causes less important. A few years ago the Card. [Gibbons] received a note from Rome calling his attention to an article in the Mirror, in which views were expressed about the temporal power which did not meet the approval of the Roman authorities.[7]

But so far as we know no rebuke came from the Holy See to the editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* nor was there apparently any warning note from Archbishop Ryan, since the journal continued on its way until the school controversy had run its course and had been settled by Leo XIII's decision of May 31, 1893, in favor of toleration for Archbishop Ireland's plan. It maintained its vigilant attitude on this question and as late as May, 1909, the monthly carried an unsigned article on "The Danger of State Legislation Interfering with Our Rights of Education." But whatever displeasure Cardinal Gibbons had felt with the *Review* in 1892 it passed away and five years later he told Fr. Heuser:

> Observation convinces me that you have been tenacious of your high purpose; whilst your success in enlisting in the cause both intelligence

---

[5] Ireland Papers in the possession of James H. Moynihan, Gibbons to Ireland, Baltimore, March 8, 1892, copy.

[6] Mariano Cardinal Rampolla was at the time papal Secretary of State. For the opposition to the University to which Magnien referred at this time cf. Patrick H. Ahern, *The Catholic University of America, 1887-1896. The Rectorship of John J. Keane* (Washington, 1948), pp. 121-97.

[7] Archives of the Diocese of Richmond, Magnien to Ireland, Baltimore, March 31, 1892.

and scholarship is deserving of praise and encouragement. To this commendation of your work in general I must add that the more recent numbers of the *Review* have afforded me especial gratification.[8]

There were many other aspects of Catholic education discussed in the *Review* besides the ideas of Maes and Hogan on clerical training previously referred to and the controversy of Archbishop Ireland. Space will not permit mention of all of them, but there were two contributions of more than ordinary interest in the early years of the twentieth century which deserve a word of comment. In February, 1906, Fr. Francis B. Cassilly, S.J., of St. Ignatius College, Chicago, published an article on "Catholic Students at State Universities. A Growing Educational Problem." At that time there were around two thousand Catholic students enrolled in these institutions. Cassilly furnished a list of the state universities having Catholic students which showed California, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota then leading with 250 or more Catholics in the student bodies of each of these universities. While Fr. Cassilly expressed the wish that all these young men and women might be in Catholic institutions, his common sense told him that this would not happen, and he correctly foretold in 1906 that the future would see even more Catholic students in these schools. His chief remedy was directed toward the provision of Catholic chaplains for these young people, among whom, as he said, "a vigorous and scholarly priest . . . could accomplish untold good" (p. 119). A further medium offered itself, he thought, through the setting up of Catholic clubs in the state universities, which would help to hold the Catholic students together and to strengthen them in their Faith. All things considered, the Cassilly article was well balanced and sensible and the remedies which he suggested over forty years ago have long since been almost universally adopted in our day when the number of Catholic students in the secular universities and colleges has multiplied enormously. Of a different character was a second article on education which the *Review* published six and a half years later in October, 1912. Fr. Thomas F. Coakley of Pittsburgh here wrote on "Roman Seminary Life" in reminiscence of his five years' stay at the American College and he explained in

[8] American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, Heuser Papers, Gibbons to Heuser, Baltimore, Oct. 23, 1897.

some detail for his American audience what going to school in Rome was like for an American lad in the first years of the present century.

All through the years the *Review* devoted considerable space to discussion of the Church and various social problems. One of the earliest articles noticed was the very cautious and conservative interpretation of Leo XIII's encyclical, *Rerum novarum*, by René I. Holaind, S.J., of St. Francis Xavier College, New York, in the issue of August, 1891. Four years later there was an indication that the encyclical may have made a sufficient impression on one American priest to prompt Francis W. Howard, pastor of Holy Trinity Church at Jackson, Ohio, and later Bishop of Covington, to write on "Social Science. An Aid in the Ministry," for the issue of April, 1895. Shortly before he became Bishop of Fall River, Fr. William Stang of Providence was the author of a series during 1903 on "Socialism" and its principal doctrines as they touched Catholic teaching in general and Leo's encyclical in particular. In February, 1904, the first article of John A. Ryan, then a professor in the St. Paul Seminary, appeared in the *Review* under the title, "The Small Family and National Decadence." But another Ryan contribution of four years later was more in line with the field wherein he won his fame when the St. Paul professor, in August, 1908, gave a series of practical hints to his fellow priests in "The Pastor and the Social Problems of His Flock." While the article of 1904 was the first contribution of Ryan to the *Review*, during the next thirty years his name appeared at regular intervals over articles on social questions of interest to American priests. A particularly pertinent discussion, even for the present day, was featured in December, 1932, when Msgr. Ryan addressed himself to the question of "American Catholics and American Socialism." This article embodied the teaching of Pius XI's recent encyclical of May, 1931, *Quadragesimo anno*, and it was the author's conclusion that the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas could not be brought into harmony with Catholic doctrine as outlined in the encyclical. Basing his judgment on the papal pronouncement, he concluded, "Hence the Christian and Socialist conceptions of the nature, the functions and the end of both society and the individual are mutually contradictory" (p. 586).

A month after Ryan's original article appeared in *The American*

Ecclesiastical Review, William Stang wrote on "The Catholic Movement in Behalf of Social Reform" for the March, 1904, number in which he reviewed the efforts of men like Von Ketteler, Hitze, Cardinals Mermillod, Manning, and Gibbons, and Leo XIII, a discussion which Stang concluded by what he termed "Pastoral Lessons" for the American parish clergy which he thought they might learn from the work of these distinguished leaders in the field of Catholic social thought and action. In the same category was the first article for the *Review* from William J. Kerby in June, 1913, in which he treated "The Catholic Charities of a City." Kerby had taken his doctorate at the University of Louvain with a dissertation entitled *Socialism aux Etats-Unis* (Brussels, 1897). Thus it was a field in which he felt thoroughly at ease and in the years from 1913 to his death he was one of the most frequent contributors to the *Review,* with articles on social questions as well as a long list of contributions on different aspects of priestly life. John J. Laux, writing from Cologne under the pen name of George Metlake, made a further contribution to the literature of Catholic social thought in the lengthy series he wrote for the *Review* on the life of Bishop Von Ketteler which were begun in the July, 1911, number in anticipation of the one hundredth anniversary of the bishop's birth. These articles appeared a year later in book form and were called *Christian Social Reform* (Philadelphia, 1912). By the time that World War I was coming to a close the influence of John A. Ryan upon the students he had taught after his transfer to The Catholic University of America was becoming evident. One of these men, Fr. J. W. R. Maguire, C.S.V., showed the training he had received under Ryan at Washington when he published in July, 1918, an article entitled, "Priests and the Reform of Industrial Relations." Through the medium of articles such as those mentioned above, the *Review* manifested its awareness of the importance of social problems and this emphasis was, if anything, increased after 1927 when Kerby assumed the editorship.

It was to be expected that a journal of this type should give particular prominence to theological questions. From the very outset there was hardly an issue of the *Review* in which there did not appear one or more items bearing upon some moral or dogmatic problem and setting forth the Church's teaching on the subject. When Pius X issued his encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis* of

Sept. 8, 1907, condemning the errors of Modernism, it was not long before the *Review* took up the problem. In January, 1908, it brought out an unsigned article entitled "Modernism in the Church in America." The writer stated that it was a mooted question whether there were any Modernists in the United States and, although he was careful not to give any names, it was obvious that he entertained no doubts about the matter. He wrote, "It is our frank opinion that the evils of which the Pontiff chiefly complains exist to a very large and dangerous extent in the United States" (pp. 2-3). But beyond this rather intriguing judgment which must have aroused the curiosity of his readers, the writer did not go. Further light, however, was shed on the subject in the issue of May, 1908, when Anthony Viéban, S.S., of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, contributed an article on "Who Are the Modernists of the Encyclical?" He summarized some of the heretical teaching of Loisy and Tyrrell and of one who had recently written as a Catholic layman in the *Nineteenth Century* under the name of Henry C. Corrance. But aside from these Fr. Viéban gave no names. His original article on Modernism was in good measure an answer to one of Professor Charles A. Briggs in the February issue of the *North American Review,* but he followed it by two more during 1909 when he wrote on "A Critical Valuation of Loisy's Theories" in January and "Modernism and Protestantism" in August of that year. The *Review* likewise carried a very useful survey of Modernist sentiment in November-December, 1908, by Charles Warren Currier, C.SS.R., who in 1913 became Bishop of Matanzas. Currier reviewed the literature in the leading European journals of the previous year and provided excerpts and quotations from some of the most prominent Modernists showing their reactions to the encyclical of Pius X.

Again space forbids us to give more examples of the types of theological material appearing in the *Review,* but three items may be mentioned. In four issues of 1891 Msgr. Joseph Schroeder, professor of dogmatic theology in The Catholic University of America, examined in critical detail a recently published work of Canon Salvatore di Bartolo called *Les critères théologiques* (Paris, 1889) with which Schroeder found serious fault in his series called, "Theological Minimizing and Its Latest Defender." Of more interest for present day readers would be the discussion of the dogma

of the Assumption by Frederick G. Holweck of St. Louis, compiler of *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints* (St. Louis, 1924), in the numbers of August-September, 1910, in which he examined the evidence for the doctrine. Holweck's manner of handling the question did not meet with the approval of Bishop Alexander MacDonald of Victoria, who chastised him in the January, 1911, issue for ignoring oral tradition and for other points which he found wanting in Holweck's dogmatic reasoning. One of the most interesting and timely series in theology of late years was begun in the issue of March, 1948, by the present editor, Fr. Fenton, on the subject, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church." In this manner many a theological argument was fought out in the pages of the *Review* whose readers reaped the benefit of having set before them through this medium the latest evidence on disputed questions dealing with Catholic faith and morals.

But learned treatises on the vagaries of Modernism and finely spun reasoning on the doctrine of the Assumption, useful as they were, would have proved too heavy a diet if not relieved by lighter fare. The editors of the *Review* saw to it that the reading interest of their subscribers was sustained by including brief articles from time to time of a less exacting character. For example, P. Arminio in July, 1893, gave the remedies of frugal diet, cleanliness, and systematic work for priests in his article called "Clerical Corpulency and Asceticism," and in the same issue Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., pointed lessons for his fellow priests in "The Methodical Priest and His Opposite." In January, 1905, Ethelred L. Taunton of Rome discussed "Hobbies for Ecclesiastics" which he thought should be intellectual and inexpensive such as reading the Fathers and church history or carving altars and decorating the walls of their churches with frescoes. Over two years later Fr. Thomas B. Scannell of Weybridge, England, aired his views in September, 1907, on the need for reform of the breviary. His principal complaints were that the breviary of that time was too complicated, monotonous, and excessively lengthy, and Scannell would likewise do something to remove the uncritical lessons and antiphons and make proper provision for local devotion in the divine office. Nor was the subject of church architecture and decoration neglected. In November, 1911, Charles D. Maginnis of Boston, the distinguished church architect, wrote on "Catholic Church Architecture

in America. The Village, Town and City Churches," to which he added a number of attractive illustrations. Mr. Maginnis pleaded for standards of judgment and taste on the part of the clergy and lamented the fact that so often ecclesiastical buildings were judged merely on whim. He discussed the three types of churches for city, town, and village with observations on their environmental factors, and by way of enforcing his point on the need for standards he wrote, " 'I don't know much about architecture, but I know what I like,' is familiar hearing. Sometimes modesty speaks in this; usually it is anarchy!" (p. 520). The following spring Fr. Coakley of Pittsburgh contributed an illustrated article on "The Decoration of Our Churches" for the issue of May, 1912, thus demonstrating his early interest in a subject in which he has since established himself as something of a model by his beautiful Sacred Heart Church, one of the finest Catholic church edifices in the United States. Through the section of the monthly called "Conferences" many minor matters also were answered to the satisfaction of the *Review's* readers and here they frequently found that solutions to the practical problems of their ministry could be gleaned from the journal as well as learned discussions of theoretical questions.

The church historian and the priest interested in church history likewise often discovered that *The American Ecclesiastical Review* had something of special interest for him. Thus in four issues of the year 1896, William Stang, writing from the American College at Louvain, edited a series entitled "The Unpublished Letters of Archbishop Seghers," a collection which Stang had found at the Belgian college. In June, 1896, Fr. Thomas Hughes, S.J., who was already at work on his history of the Jesuits of North America, was spending much time in Roman archives and he contributed an article to the *Review* on "The Serio-Comic in the Vatican Archives" which illustrated the type of thing which he was finding as he browsed through old manuscripts in that famous depository. Earlier that year Conradus Eubel, O.M.C., of the staff of the Vatican Archives, had given a more serious and scientific treatment to the contents of those archives in an article for January which he called "The Secret Vatican Archives." Likewise, historic events in the life of the Church of the United States were chronicled in the *Review,* as was the case when Pius X on June 14, 1907, put all the Catholics of Ruthenian (Greek) rite in this country under a bishop

of that rite who was to receive his jurisdiction from the ordinaries of dioceses in which he performed his ministry. This event was covered in November of that year by an unsigned article on "The Appointment of a Greek Bishop in the United States." Eleven years later John M. Cooper explained in December, 1918, for the American clergy the story behind the organization of the National Catholic War Council in an article of that title, stating that credit should first be given to the Knights of Columbus for their prompt and efficient efforts at the outbreak of war. He then explained how gradually the Catholic war effort grew until it necessitated a more formal organization. At the call of Cardinals Gibbons, Farley, and O'Connell, a meeting was held at The Catholic University of America on Aug. 11-12, 1917, at which delegates of sixty-eight dioceses and twenty-seven national Catholic organizations were present. This was followed by a meeting at the University on Jan. 16, 1918, when Cardinal Gibbons named the administrative committee of bishops who met at the same time to set up the N.C.W.C. The four prelates were Bishops Peter J. Muldoon, Joseph Schrembs, Patrick J. Hayes, and William T. Russell. Also chronicled through publication of the letters of Benedict XV, Cardinal Gibbons, and others, were the preliminaries for the first annual meeting of the entire hierarchy in September, 1919. Readers of the *Review* got a general idea of how the procedure would shape up at Washington in September by the explanation carried by the *Review* in its issue of July, 1919.

Regardless of how many names or titles might be cited in a survey of this kind, no commemorative essay on the sixtieth anniversary of a periodical such as the present effort can give an adequate idea of the richness of content which the old volumes of a journal like *The American Ecclesiastical Review* contain for the student of American Catholic thought. Hardly more than an indication can be offered in an essay of this length of what the reader will find here. While it would be wrong to exaggerate the importance of the *Review*, it would not be over-stating the case to say that its 120 volumes contain a mine of information for the clergy of the United States and foreign lands and that buried away in these volumes is the material out of which there can one day be constructed a notable chapter in the history of the American Church. Here is a significant segment of Catholic clerical thought,

and if ever the time should come that an historian in our country would attempt to do for the Church of the United States what Henri Brémond did in his splendid *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux* (Paris, 1916-33) for the Church of France he will have to depend in no small measure on *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for the source of much of his material. It is true that there is at present no prospect of an historian of American Catholic culture who stands ready to shoulder the task of a Brémond for the United States. As a people we Americans have not taken naturally to the exacting discipline of speculation and the history of religious thought. Even now, eighty years removed as we are from the Vatican Council, the words which the young Bishop James Gibbons wrote at that time are still in good measure true of us. Gibbons had been fascinated as he listened in the council to the learned debates of the old world bishops on abstruse theological questions, and reflecting on the various schools of thought which he believed he saw in the conciliar debates he said: "In the United States we have been comparatively free from them. We owe it, probably, to the fact that with us all men are so busy trying to amass fortunes that they have little time and less taste for such abstruse speculations." [9] But the day must sometime come when the history of American Catholic thought will be written, however slight it may appear in contrast to the Catholic thought of old Europe.[10] We American Catholics have, it is true, lagged in the cultivation of cultural pursuits, and the idea of a dignified and productive leisure has yet to take root among the American clergy as it has in a country like France. But the Church of the United States is still young and as the acute problems of growth and adjustment gradually pass, as they are presently doing, there will be no excuse remaining for the neglect of the study of our native American Catholic culture. When that age of maturity arrives it will be media such as *The American Ecclesiastical Review* which will give proof that while the Church of this Republic has by no means occupied a leading role in cultural accomplishments during the past sixty

[9] James Cardinal Gibbons, *A Retrospect of Fifty Years* (Baltimore, 1916), I, 87.

[10] A good start toward a history of American Catholic social thought was made by C. Joseph Huesse in *The Social Thought of American Catholics, 1634-1829* (Washington, 1945) and the other doctoral dissertations of the Department of Sociology of The Catholic University of America.

years, its contributions have not been altogether negligible. As one writer has stated, American Catholics have still to learn that the Catholic Church is the mother of the arts, the soul of civilization, but as he added, "give them time; they will."[11]

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[11] Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York, 1941), p. 586.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1899, is entitled "The History of Auricular Confession." The author, Fr. L. Delplace, S.J., of Louvain, severely criticizes H. C. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church,* and contends that from the writings of Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, etc., it can be established that both public and private confession were in use in the early centuries of the Christian era. . . . Professor Virginio Prinzivalli of Rome writes on the archeological treasures of the Lateran Museum, deeming such an article to be opportune in view of the approaching Jubilee, just proclaimed for 1900 by Pope Leo XIII. . . . Fr. T. Slater, S.J., writing on the study of Moral Theology before the time of St. Raymund of Pennafort, gives an interesting account of the "Penitentials" of the middle ages. He asserts: "From the beginning of the Church's activity as a regenerator of society means were never lacking to enable the priest to obtain that theoretical and practical knowledge which is required for the fruitful administration of the Sacrament of Penance." . . . Fr. Heuser, the editor, writing under the title "Pedagogy in Religious Orders," expresses some practical principles of the art of teaching, such as "The secret of educating well lies in a knowledge of the human heart, in patience and in the power of example." . . . Fr. G. Tyrrell, S.J., contributes an article on "True and False Mysticism." Some indication of his subsequent lapse may be seen in his emphasis on the appeal to the inner consciousness in support of the Catholic faith: "Those who understand our times are not perhaps wrong when they say that if the Church is ever to get hold of the men of good will outside her pale, it will be through the satisfaction she offers to the ineradicable mystical appetite of the human soul."

F.J.C.

HERMAN J. HEUSER: FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

The name of Herman J. Heuser will ever be associated with *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* which he founded in 1888 and actively edited till 1927, six years before his death. He will be remembered by all who knew him, especially by thousands of the clergy and laity of Philadelphia, not only as a professor and author but, above all, as the editor of the magazine for the clergy, which from its very beginning set a high standard of excellence for such publications. A member of the hierarchy once said to the present writer that no priest of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia exercised a greater influence on the clergy of his time than did Fr. Heuser and this was due chiefly to his position as editor of the *Review.*

A native of Germany, where he was born on Oct. 23, 1852, in Potsdam, Prussia, Herman Heuser's education was first acquired in Potsdam, Berlin, and Breslau, and continued in the United States at the diocesan Seminary of Philadelphia, first at Glen Riddle and then at Overbrook, in the institution where he served as teacher throughout the many years of his priesthood. Even before his ordination by Archbishop Wood, on Feb. 2, 1876, Mr. Heuser was a student-professor in the Seminary which was to be his only assignment as a priest. An interesting detail is that his ordination took place, not in the Cathedral of Philadelphia, but in the chapel of the Seminary with which he was to be so long and so intimately associated.

While in the many decades of his teaching at Overbrook Fr. Heuser was assigned subjects in several theological disciplines, it was as professor of Sacred Scripture that he functioned for nearly all of the long period of his academic life. He had no technical training in Biblical studies but was quite *autodidactus.* In the days of his ecclesiastical education, there was no Pontifical Biblical Institute for the special formation of Scriptural scholars. But Fr. Heuser brought a sincere interest and painstaking study to the preparation of his courses. He was not a brilliant lecturer, but an interesting teacher. He varied the subjects which he presented to his classes so that there was a freshness about them, which was healthy for both professor and student. One year he devoted himself to the study of St. Luke and his classes read the third Gospel

and the Acts of the Apostles. Another year, the Catholic Epistles claimed his attention and we read St. James and St. Jude. The class following, however, would have an entirely different text, perhaps the Psalms, or the Epistles of St. Paul. Touches of unexpected humor illuminated the lectures, as when he contrasted the elegance of St. Barnabas with the less imposing appearance of St. Paul.

Though English was for Fr. Heuser an acquired tongue, he wrote it with a facility and grace which would shame many authors who write it as their native language. His printed works number many volumes, besides the innumerable contributions which he made to this *Review*. Not always did these articles appear under his own name. "Fra Arminio" was his favorite *nom de plume*. Among his larger books should be mentioned *Chapters of Bible Study, The Harmony of the Religious Life,* and his life of St. Paul, *From Tarsus to Rome*. His best known biography is that of Canon Sheehan, *Canon Sheehan of Doneraile,* a life of the distinguished Irish writer, whom Fr. Heuser introduced to the United States. Old readers of the *Review* will remember that the two most popular works of the Canon, *My New Curate* and *Luke Delmege,* came out serially in its pages. Many of Fra Arminio's articles in the *Review,* dealing mainly with subjects cognate to that of pastoral theology, were collected to appear in book form in such volumes as: *The Autobiography of an Old Breviary, The Meditations of an Ex-Prelate,* and *The Archbishop's Pocketbook*. He paid tribute to the memory of Msgr. William Heinan's missionary labors in *Pastor Halloft* and wrote the biography of a pioneer Sister of Mercy in *Mother Mary Patricia Waldron*.

The most striking characteristic of Fr. Heuser, which made an indelible impression on all those who had any contact with him, was his amazing industry. It is related of St. Alphonsus Liguori that he made a vow never to lose an instant of time. Herman Heuser seemed to have taken upon himself the same obligation. Even the short journey from his room to the class-hall would be devoted to correcting proof as he walked along. Not gifted with a quick memory, the preparation of his lectures involved more time than his students could imagine. Added to his duties as a professor at the Seminary, he was the favorite confessor of the seminarians and every Saturday a long queue formed at his door

seeking absolution and especially good counsel from him. Naturally, the *Review* claimed the major part of his time. In the early years of the publication, he did practically everything involved in the monthly issue of the magazine, the business management as well as the editorial direction, and he was always a frequent contributor to its pages, though rarely under his own name. Besides, many of the book-reviews came from his fluent pen. Later on and for many years, he had the able assistance of the late Edward Galbally to attend to such practical matters as advertising, publication, and printing.

Fr. Heuser was of a most retiring disposition. We have spoken of his wide influence on the clergy of this country of his time. But, of the thousands who felt the impress of that influence, only scores came to know personally the man who wielded it. Naturally, the hundreds of students who sat under him in the Overbrook Seminary came to know him, but only as a professor and a confessor. After ordination, few of the thousands of priests whom he had taught in the Seminary ever had any contact with him as he avoided the usual assemblies which bring diocesan priests together. He was never promoted from the black cassock to prelatial robes. Only one honor came to him from the Holy See and that was the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity, which was conferred on him in 1905. By that time, he had been known so long as Fr. Heuser that he rarely was addressed by the title of doctor. It was explained to us in the Seminary that he consented to the degree only because he thought it would lend some distinction to his position as editor of the *Review*.

Fr. Heuser's appearance was such that, at least to the seminarians, he always seemed an old man. His nickname with the students was "Poppy," even when he was a priest less than twenty-five years ordained. The combination of a bald head and a beard, no doubt, gave this impression of age. His garb was of the most conservative clerical character. To protect his head he wore a black skull-cap of the kind now usually associated with undertakers' assistants. His cassock was of the type more properly called a *simar,* the one made with a shoulder cape and false sleeves. His beard, which he grew very early in his priesthood, was for years a "Horace Greeley" growth on the lower jaw, the upper lip being shaved. Towards the end of his life, he wore the full beard

and was known to some of his friends as "St. Joseph." With his black hat, of unmistakable clerical style, his *infra genua* coat, and black cloth bag, when he went into the city, he was more often taken for a bearded Protestant dominie than for a Catholic priest. All, however, looking into his face, would recognize a man of deep spiritual life.

Fr. Heuser led his busy life of professor and editor till he had passed beyond the golden anniversary of his ordination. In 1927, he retired from teaching in the Seminary and directing the *Review*. He continued to live at the Seminary and retained his interest in the *Review*, which passed into the control of The Catholic University of America. Even in retirement, his life was still busy, though he himself claimed that all his time was spent in preparation for death, which included giving away his worldly possessions, mostly books. Death came to him in the eighty-first year of his life and the fifty-eighth of his priesthood, on Aug. 21, 1933. His funeral was as humble as his life had been. He was buried as a Tertiary of St. Dominic, in white habit and violet stole, and was interred in a simple grave, with his parents, in the family lot in the Holy Redeemer Cemetery, Bridesburg, Philadelphia. His visible monument, *aere perennius,* remains in the well-nigh four score volumes of the *Review* which appeared under his editorship, and an invisible monument perdures, represented by his influence, which defies card-indexing, on the tens of thousands of readers of the *Review* and the thousands of priests who, as seminarians, were under his guidance.

The panegyric of Fr. Heuser might well be phrased in the transposed words of Cardinal Newman in his famous sermon over Henry Weedall, "The Tree beside the Waters." "He shall be like a tree which is planted near the running waters, which shall bring forth its fruit in due season. And his leaf shall not fall off; and all whatsoever he shall do shall prosper" (Psalms 1:3). The spiritual plant of God is placed by the running waters. It grows up gradually, silently, without observation. Its very leaf remains green to the end. The holy servant of God resembles a tree in his graciousness, his fruitfulness, and in his immobility. Like a tree, Fr. Heuser was confined to one place, the diocesan Seminary at Overbrook, but his influence was nation-wide, though his name was not one of national reputation. His life was one of happy ob-

scurity but of multiplied impact. As the tree, which remains hidden in the grove, where it grows and blossoms and bears fruit, while its fruit is exported to the ends of the earth, so Fr. Heuser, from his sheltered life in St. Charles' Seminary, made his influence felt, scarcely without making his name known, in all the dioceses of this country and of Canada, as well as of England and Ireland. Like the subject of Cardinal Newman's sermon, "he labored to the very end, in humility, diligence, and love."

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MEDITATION AND PREACHING

An interesting question arises as to the relation between meditation and preaching. If a priest who is faithful to the habit of meditation looks upon it in the main as a form of preparation of sermons, he will cheat himself. Of course, all preaching should be the result of serious thinking and preparation. Any sermon that represents little effort or thought does not give promise of much fruit. Now meditation is thinking about spiritual reality for the purpose of personal sanctification. One keeps one's soul, one's faults, one's duties, spiritual aspirations and responsibilities in mind. In preaching, a priest thinks of the souls of others. He is teacher and guide. He interprets their needs, appeals to their imagination and intelligence, speaking in the name of Christ. Whilst each function serves the other, the two are distinct. One can lose zeal for personal spiritual growth in the larger zeal for the welfare of souls. I do not know how widespread this practice may be. A priest who during his annual retreat would spend much of his time making notes for future sermons might easily miss the self-discipline upon which the success of the retreat for him personally depends. Once he has taken everything that the retreat offers to serve his own spiritual welfare as a primary purpose, he should be free for the note-taking that would serve his future preaching.

—William J. Kerby, "Meditation," *AER*, XCIII, 4 (Oct. 1935), 364 f.

OUR LADY IN THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

During the course of the sixty years of the existence of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* scores of articles have appeared on its pages in praise of Our Lady. They differ both in merit and in point of view. Some of these articles are devotional, written with a view to offering to the busy pastor material for his Marian novenas, while the majority of them are of a scientific character. Among these latter one finds a wealth of material to aid him toward a deeper insight into the mysteries that surround and glorify the Mother of God. With few exceptions every phase of the study of Mariology finds adequate expression somewhere in the pages of the *Review* during the course of the past sixty years.

It is the purpose of this article to indicate in some small way what the Review has contributed over the years of its existence toward the study of the privileges of our Blessed Lady from a theological point of view. A mere cursory glance over the pages of the *Review,* however, should suffice to indicate that a crystallization of the thought contained in even the best of its articles would demand far more space than could possibly be allotted to any one such synthesis.

We feel that such a purpose can be served by selecting one or the other phase of the study of Mariology and tracing its development through the issues of the *Review.* Such a method of procedure should sufficiently bring to light the place that the *Review* deserves in the minds of the students of theology in the field devoted to the inquiry into the doctrines that treat of the Mother of God. For this purpose we have selected the *Immaculate Conception* and the *Bodily Assumption of Mary Into Heaven.*

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

The customary method of procedure in treating the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception from an historical and theological point of view is to distinguish three stages in its development. Of these the first is known as *The Stage of Implicit Faith* embracing, roughly, the Patristic and pre-Scholastic eras. During these periods in the development of theology the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was not taught *explicitly* but was *implicitly* believed in

that it is logically contained in the teachings of these periods concerning Mary's ever-spotless purity and perfect stainlessness, in the contrast between Mary and Eve, and in the almost universal belief that Mary, because of her purity, merited *de congruo* the great dignity of the Divine Maternity.

In an article entitled: "The Term 'Immaculate' in the Early Greek Fathers," by G. E. Price of Birmingham, England,[1] we find a veritable litany of titles culled from the writings of the Eastern Fathers with which the Oriental mind expressed its belief in the ineffable purity and absolute sinlessness of the Immaculate Mother of God. "In these numerous encomiums penned by the Greek Fathers," the author reminds us, "nothing could be more striking than their effort to convey the idea which corresponds to the Latin 'immaculata.'" These encomiums—each with its α privative corresponding to the Latin *im*—praise Mary by denying some definite spot or stain of the Immaculate Mother of God. Added to these titles are numerous others in which the Greek compound παν is used in conjunction with the α privative to emphasize in true Oriental fashion the belief of the Eastern Fathers in the spotlessness of the Mother of God. The value of Fr. Price's article rests on the fact that he has gathered into one collection the adjectives expressive of Mary's absolute purity used by the early Greek writers in which modern-day theologians find implicitly contained the belief in her Immaculate Conception.

Besides the *terms* in which the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is implicitly contained, the writers of the first eleven centuries developed "as an extension of the Pauline contrast between Adam and Christ,[2] an antithesis between the woman who shared in the fall of our first parent and the woman who shared in the reparation of that fall."[3] The point of the comparison in these writings is the fact that just as Eve was free from corruption when addressed by the serpent so, too, was Mary when addressed by the Angel.[4] In the pages of the *Review* we find many excellent

[1] *AER*, XXXI, 6 (Dec. 1904), 545 ff.

[2] Cf. *Rom.* 5:19.

[3] F. J. Connell, C.SS.R., "Historical Development of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception," *AER*, CXIV, 5 (May, 1946), 342.

[4] Cf. for example, St. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryphone*, 100 (*MPG*, VI, 710); St. Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, V, 2, 1 (*MPG*, VII, 1179); Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, 17 (*MPL*, II, 782).

summaries of this argument together with the argument taken from the belief that Mary, because of the perfection of her purity, merited *de congruo* the dignity of the Divine Maternity.[5]

The second stage in the development of the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception is known as *The Stage of Controversy.* During this period, which began around the time of the twelfth century and ended about the time of Pope Sixtus IV,[6] many even among the great Scholastics taught a doctrine concerning the Immaculate Conception now known to be absolutely false in the light of the comparatively recent definition of Pope Pius IX.[7] This teaching was due to no lack of love for the Immaculate Mother of God but to an apparent inability to harmonize the revealed fact of the universality of the redemptive work of Christ with the implicit teaching of the Fathers concerning the *absolute* sinlessness of Mary, His Mother. All men sinned in Adam, and all who came into the world through carnal generation from him are stained with the taint of original sin. Mary, therefore, must be no exception. The notion of preservative redemption was unknown to these Scholastics.

Outstanding among those who so denied the Immaculate Conception is generally numbered the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas. In

[5] Cf. "Mary's Immaculate Conception," by F. Kaiser, C.PP.S., *AER,* XCVII, 6 (Dec. 1937), 513 ff; "Historical Development of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception," by F. J. Connell, C.SS.R., *AER,* CXIV, 5 (May, 1946), 340 ff; "Our Glorious Immaculate," by Charles Coppens, S.J., *AER,* XXX, 5 (May, 1904), 449 ff; "The Union of the Churches," by S. M. Brandi, *AER,* XIV, 3 (March, 1896), 233 ff; whose doctrine is based upon the well ordered digests of the Patristic commentaries on Gen. 3:15 and St. Luke 1:28, 42, entitled: *Sylloge Monumentorum ad Mysterium Conceptionis Immaculatae* (Rome: Typis Civiltatis Catholicae, 1854) and *De Immaculato Deiparae Semper Virginis Conceptu,* of Passaglia (Rome: Typis de Prop. Fidei, 1854).

[6] In two Apostolic Constitutions Pope Sixtus IV approved the belief in Mary's Immaculate Conception and condemned those who maintained that this belief was heretical. Cf. *Cum praeexcelsa,* Feb. 28, 1476 (*DB,* 734) and *Gravi nimis,* Sept. 4, 1483 (*DB,* 735).

[7] Thus, for example, St. Bonaventure: ". . . *quia nullus immunis fuit a culpa originalis peccati nisi solum Filius Virginis,*" *Sent. lib. III,* d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2 (*Opera Omnia,* Quarrachi, 1887), III, 66; St. Bernard, *Ep. ad Canonicos Lugd.* 174, n. 5, 7 et 9 (*MPL,* CLXXXII, 332); St. Albert the Great, *In III Sent.,* d. 3, q. 4 (*Opera Omnia,* Lugduni, 1651) XV, 26.

the *Summa theologica* and *Compendium theologiae*[8] he explicitly denies the Immaculate Conception of Mary because such a belief would derogate from the dignity of Christ as the *universal* Redeemer of mankind. Conceived in sin she was, however, cleansed of it immediately after her conception so that she left her mother's womb immaculate.[9]

In an article anent the teaching of St. Thomas on the Immaculate Conception,[10] Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., translates and comments upon the twenty-seventh question of the third part of the *Summa,* which question is usually cited as proof positive of the fact that the Angelic Doctor denied the Immaculate Conception in the sense in which it was later defined by Pope Pius IX. It is Father Pope's contention that the words of St. Thomas: ". . . the Blessed Virgin did indeed contract original sin but she was cleansed of it before her birth," [11] do not *necessarily prove* that he denied the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as we know it today. Fr. Pope reminds us that St. Thomas did not write in the light of the controversies of the present day nor did he use terms in precisely the way in which they are now used.[12] The whole point of difficulty, he maintains, lies in the sense which the Angelic Doctor assigns to the word *contracted.*[13]

The author of the article in question looks to III, q. 14, a. 3, under the title: "Did Christ *contract* bodily defects?" to find the meaning which St. Thomas attaches to the word *contract.* The Angelic Doctor answers this question in the negative explaining that by the word *contract* we understand the relation of effect to cause so that that is said to be contracted which follows necessarily

[8] *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 27, a. 2, ad 2: "*Si numquam anima Virginis fuisset contagio originalis peccati inquinata, hoc derogaret dignitati Christi, secundum quam est universalis omnium Salvator. . . . B. Virgo contraxit quidem originale peccatum, sed ab eo fuit mundata, antequam ex utero nasceretur.*" And in the *Compendium theologiae,* c. 244: "*B. Virgo . . . cum peccato originali concepta fuit, sed ab eo, quodam speciali modo purgata fuit.*"

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] "The Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God and the Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas," by Hugh Pope, O.P., *AER,* XXXI, 6 (Dec. 1904), 566 ff.

[11] *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 27, a. 2, ad 2.

[12] Cf. *op. cit.,* p. 570.

[13] *Ibid.*

from a certain cause. In this connection we say that we contract a certain disease because we take its cause, a germ, into our system. Now they are said to *contract* corporal defects who incur them as a debt due to sin. From this St. Thomas concludes that Christ, having no sin, did not *contract* bodily defects—because the cause of them, sin, was lacking in Him—but voluntarily took them upon Himself. "But," the Saint urges, "could not Christ be said to have contracted these defects when He took human nature from His mother who was herself subjected to them?" And in answering this difficulty he begins by saying: "The *flesh* of the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin and therefore she contracted those defects."

Fr. Pope, then distinguishing between *conception* by which he denotes the formation of the tabernacle for the soul and *animation* by which he means the infusion of that soul by the Hand of God, argues that the flesh of Mary was conceived under the general law whereby one carnally conceived from Adam should incur the debt of sin (hence, her flesh was conceived *in* i.e. *under the general law of sin*) but at the moment of animation her soul was filled with God's grace precluding the actual *contracting* of the sin.

It is quite possible that Fr. Pope, in his zeal to defend the orthodoxy of St. Thomas, read into the teaching of the Angelic Doctor the doctrine of William of Ware,[14] the professor of Duns Scotus, and of Scotus himself.[15] To these eminent theologians must be credited the distinction between contracting the *debt* of original sin and *actually* contracting the sin—or between preservative redemption (predicated of Mary) and restorative redemption (predicated of the rest of mankind).

The third and last stage in the development of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception is known as *The Stage of Explicit Faith.* This stage began with the official pronouncements of Pope Sixtus IV cited above,[16] proceeding through the teaching of the Council of Trent in which the Fathers of that Council explicitly stated that in their pronouncements on original sin they did not intend to

[14] Cf. *Fr. Gulielmi Guarre, Fr. Ioannis Duns Scoti, Fr. Petri Aureoli Quaestiones disputatae de Immaculata Conceptione Beatae Mariae Virginis* (Quarrachi: Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, 1904), pp. 1-11.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-22.

[16] Cf. *supra*, n. 6.

include Mary,[17] through the condemnation of Baius by Pope Pius V in 1667 for teaching that Mary was dead to the sin of Adam;[18] through the express teaching of Pope Alexander VII on Mary's Immaculate Conception;[19] and culminating in the solemn definition of Pope Pius IX.[20] Although we find no articles in the *Review* devoted solely to this stage in the development of the dogma *as such*, yet there are fine commentaries on it in the general articles on the Immaculate Conception by Frs. Kaiser, Coppens, and Connell.[21]

THE BODILY ASSUMPTION OF MARY INTO HEAVEN

In recent years the definability of the doctrine of the bodily Assumption of Mary into Heaven has been absorbing the attention of Catholic theologians throughout the world. This study has received new impetus from the encyclical letter of Pope Pius XII, *Deiparae Virginis Mariae*, of May 1st, 1946. In this letter the Holy Father informs us that over a long period of years the Holy See has received many petitions from Cardinals, Archbishops, priests and religious requesting the definition of the Assumption as a dogma of faith.[22] Now, following the method of procedure of his predecessor, Pope Pius IX, previous to the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, Pope Pius XII asks the Bishops of the world to inform him of the devotion with which their flocks honor Mary in the mystery of the Assumption, whether the Bishops themselves think that the Assumption is definable, and whether or not they desire the definition.

For one who is unfamiliar with the various stages in the development of this dogma which will soon reach its climax—we trust—

[17] Trent, *(Sessio V) Decretum super peccato originali* (*DB*, 792).

[18] Cf. Bulla, *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, Oct. 1, 1567 (*DB*, 1073).

[19] Cf. Bulla, *Sollicitudo omnium eccl.*, of Dec. 8, 1661 (*DB*, 1100).

[20] Cf. Bulla, *Ineffabilis Deus*, Dec. 8, 1854 (*DB*, 1641).

[21] Cf. *supra*, n. 5. Cf. also, "The Theology of the Immaculate Conception," by J. J. Loughran, *AER*, LXXVI, 5 (May, 1925), 518 ff.

[22] For a collection of these petitions, cf. *Petitiones de Assumptione corporea B. V. Mariae in coelum definienda ad Sanctam Sedem delatae*, edd. Guilhelmo Hentrich et Rudolfo G. De Moos (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1942).

in the much desired definition, the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* during the past sixty years offer ample material.[23]

Sacred Scripture and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers contain no factual, circumstantial history of the death and subsequent Assumption of Our Lady into Heaven. The earliest written accounts of her death and Assumption are a number of apocryphal works which, though they disagree in many of the main details of Mary's passing from this earth, significantly agree in the *fact* of her death and in portraying it and her Assumption as accompanied by some miraculous intervention from God.[24] Other than the fact that these Apocrypha point to the existence of an early popular belief in the Assumption of Mary, they must be discredited as sources of Tradition or as early authentic accounts of Mary's death and subsequent Assumption into Heaven. Their legendary and imaginative character is evident from the improbable miracles which they portray as attendant upon Mary's death and passing from this earth and from their many inconsistencies with the canonical books of the New Testament.

The fact that there is no early circumstantial history nor explicit Apostolic tradition of the death and Assumption of Mary is one of the main arguments used by the opponents of the definability of the doctrine of the Assumption. Such is one of the arguments advanced by Fr. Martin Jugie in his monumental work entitled: *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vièrge: Étude historico-doctrinale* (Città del Vaticano, 1944).

In the March, 1948, issue of the *Review,* Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M., summarizes the main arguments of Fr. Jugie against the

[23] Cf. for example, "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary," by Rev. F. G. Holwek, *AER,* XLIII, 2, 3 (Aug. and Sept. 1910), 129, 257 ff; "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a criticism," by his Excellency, Alexander MacDonald, D.D., *AER,* XLIV, 1 (Jan. 1911), 53 ff; "The Reply," by Rev. F. G. Holwek, *AER,* XLIV, 1 (Jan. 1911), 66 ff; "The Dogmatic Definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary as an Article of Faith," in "Studies and Conferences," *AER,* LIII, 3 (Sept. 1915); "The Assumption in the Apocrypha," by A. C. Rush, C.SS.R., *AER,* CXVI, 1 (Jan. 1947), 5 ff; "The Definability of Mary's Assumption," by the Rev. Juniper Carol, O.F.M., *AER,* CXVIII, 3 (March 1948), 161 ff.

[24] For an excellent treatment of the Assumption in the Apocrypha cf. an article under that title by the Rev. A. C. Rush, C.SS.R., *AER,* CXVI, 1 (Jan. 1947), 5 ff.

definability of the Assumption[25] and, in his reply to these objections asserts that the opponents of the definition over-emphasize the necessity of positive, clear, evident *historical* data reaching back to the first or second century in order to establish the Assumption of Mary.[26] Such historical data is not necessary, Fr. Carol rightly maintains, for, in order to prove the revealed character of a given doctrine it is sufficient to show that *today* it is clearly taught as such by the *Magisterium ordinarium* of the Church. Father Carol says:

> In order to establish the continuity of a given doctrine throughout the ages it is not necessary that we possess an uninterrupted chain of explicit testimonies linking our times with the Apostolic period. . . . the custody and infallible interpretation of the deposit of faith has been entrusted by God to a living organism which is the Church, and since the Church of today is the same moral person it was in the first century it follows that whatever the Church of today holds and teaches as pertaining to the original deposit of revelation was also held and taught (at least implicitly) by the Church of the first centuries . . . since the Catholic Episcopate believes our Lady's Assumption to be of faith, as has been abundantly proved by their petitions to the Holy See, we are authorized to conclude that this doctrine forms an integral part of the original deposit of revelation even in the absence of the so-called 'historical evidence.'[27]

That the Catholic episcopate of today believes our Lady's Assumption to be of faith is clearly shown by the petitions mentioned by Father Carol and referred to by the Holy Father in his encyclical, *Deiparae Virginis Mariae*. An excellent summary of these petitions has recently been made by the Rev. Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R., in an article contained in the *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America*.[28] Fr. Wuenschel points out that the largest and most significant group of all the petitions submitted to the Holy See requesting the definition of the doctrine of Mary's Bodily Assump-

[25] Cf. *op. cit.*, 162 ff.
[26] Cf. *ibid.*, 164 ff.
[27] Cf. *ibid.*, and 165.
[28] Pp. 90 ff.

tion is the 1,789 petitions submitted by resident Bishops ruling 820 Sees or 73 percent of all the Sees in the world.[29]

On the other hand, however, although there is no explicit Apostolic tradition to the fact of Mary's Assumption, we must not overlook the evidence that is present in the Infant Church pointing to a rather early explicit belief. Among the feasts of our Blessed Mother the most ancient is that of the *dormitio* whose object included the Assumption of Mary into Heaven. This feast seems to have arisen shortly after the Council of Ephesus in the East. Thus, Nicephorus Calistus, a Greek Historian of the fourteenth century, mentions the fact that the Emperor Mauritius (582-602) *changed* the date of the feast in the Byzantine Empire from the 18th of January to the 15th of August.[30] And from Gregory of Tours we know that the feast was celebrated in Jerusalem in the latter part of the sixth century.[31] Now the presence of a feast does not mean that belief in a doctrine began with the inauguration of the feast which commemorates it but rather that the belief of the faithful had then come to maturity.

The full doctrinal development of the Assumption, however, does not appear until the seventh and eighth centuries in the writings of the Fathers of the East,[32] whereas in the West this development was retarded by the fact that the ignorance of Greek in the West caused the writings of the Eastern Fathers to remain closed to the Western mind until rather late in the scholastic age. Fr. Holweck, in the August, 1910, issue of the *Review* gives an excellent, though brief, summary of these early stages in the development of the doc-

[29] *Ibid.* Fr. Wuenschel quotes the editors of the *Petitiones* who drew the following conclusion as the result of their collection of the petitions sent in to the Holy See by the Resident Bishops of the world: *Ergo constat (ex textibus revelationis atque doctrinae magisterii, sive immediatis sive mediatis) adesse verum et proprium consensum universalem totius Ecclesiae Docentis: doctrinam Assumptionis corporeae B. V. Mariae tamquam dogma fidei definiri posse et hanc definitionem opportunam esse.* Cf. *Petitiones,* I, p. xxiii.

[30] Cf. *Hist. Eccl.,* XVIII, 18 (*MPG,* CXLVII, 192).

[31] Cf. *De Gloria Martyrum,* lib. I, cap. IV, IX (*MPL,* LXXI, 708, 713).

[32] Cf. for example, St. Modestus of Jerusalem, *Encomium in dormitionem sanctissimae Dominae Nostrae (MPG,* LXXXVI, 3277, 3312); St. Germanus of Constantinople, *In dormitionem B. Mariae (MPG,* XCVIII, 339-72); St. Andrew of Crete, *In dormitionem sanctissimae Deiparae Dominae Nostrae (MPG,* XCVII, 1045-110); St. John Damascene, *In dormitionem B. V. Mariae (MPG,* XCVI, 700-61). Cf. E. A. Wuenschel, *op. cit.,* p. 87.

trine of the Assumption.[33] In this article, however, Fr. Holweck places too much stress on what he considered the influence of the Apocrypha on the writings of the Greek Fathers. For this he was roundly criticized by Bishop Alexander MacDonald of Victoria.[34]

During the Scholastic period, while the precise nature of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was the subject of much theological controversy, the Scholastics were unanimous in their belief in the Bodily Assumption of our Lady into Heaven. From that time to the present this belief was never called into doubt by any who gloried in the name Catholic. Thus, from *at least* the sixth century with the inauguration of the feast of the *dormitio* to the present, the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary into Heaven has enjoyed the belief of the faithful.

Today we have proof positive of the fact that the doctrine of the Assumption enjoys the belief of the faithful and the teaching of the Universal Magisterium of the Church to the extent that both the *Ecclesia Credens* and the *Ecclesia Docens* hold it to be a doctrine definable as a truth contained in the deposit of revelation. This universal consensus of Bishops, theologians, priests, religious, and the laity must stem from the fact that the Assumption is implicitly contained in the traditional notion of the Divine Maternity: the concrete notion of Mary, *as the Mother of the Redeemer,* associated with Christ in His *complete* victory over Satan.

Using the argument taken from the office of co-redemptrix in proof of the fact that the Assumption is implicitly contained in the notion of Mary as the Mother of the Divine Redeemer associated with Him in His victory over Satan, Fr. Juniper Carol argues as follows in his scholarly article on the definability of Mary's Assumption:

". . . the manner in which Christ fulfilled His office as Redeemer of the human race was precisely by obtaining a *complete* and *total* victory over the devil and his dominion; which victory culminated in His anticipated glorious resurrection. Now, our Blessed Lady, being the co-

---

[33] "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary," *AER,* XLIII, 3 (Sept. 1910), 257 ff.

[34] "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a criticism," *AER,* XLIV, 1 (Jan. 1911), 53 ff.

redemptrix of mankind, shared Christ's identical victory over the devil and his dominion. Therefore, she, too, enjoyed the privilege of an anticipated glorious resurrection."[35]

Fr. Carol then proceeds to prove the major of his "syllogism improperly so-called," namely, that the manner in which Christ fulfilled His office of Redeemer of the human race was by obtaining a *complete* and *total* victory over Satan. This is evident from the fact that immediately after the fall of our first parents God foretold the coming of the Redeemer *who would crush the serpent's head.*[36] And St. Paul tells us that Christ gained that victory precisely as Redeemer.[37] That this victory extended to bodily death is evident from the Epistle to the Hebrews: ". . . that through death He might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil."[38] And that this victory, to be total and complete, required an anticipated resurrection may be gathered from the Epistle to the Romans: "Christ rising from the dead dies no more, death shall no more have dominion over Him."[39] Hence, Fr. Carol concludes, if Christ had remained dead even in an incorrupt state, His victory would not have been total and complete.

The minor premise, namely, that Mary is the co-redemptrix of mankind, and that she shared in the complete and total victory of her Son over Satan and his dominion is based upon the Protoevangelium and the Magisterium of the Church crystallized by Pope Pius IX in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* of Dec. 8, 1854.[40] In this Bull, in which the Pope promulgated the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception, the Holy Father himself argues to Mary's *complete* victory over Satan *with* and *in* Christ. Fr. Carol in his article on the definability of the Assumption gives us an excellent commentary on this teaching of the Holy Father which we heartily recommend to the attention of the reader.[41]

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO MARIOLOGY

Outstanding among the many other contributions made to the study of Mariology by *The American Ecclesiastical Review* during the course of its existence are, first of all, two articles on the Divine Maternity. The first of these articles is entitled: "*Natus ex Maria*

[35] *Op. cit.*, p. 171.
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] Cf. *Col.* 2: 14, 15.
[38] *Hebr.* 2: 14.
[39] *Rom.* 6: 9.
[40] Cf. Fr. Carol, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
[41] *Ibid.*

Virgine" by Fr. Edward Bergin, S.J.,[42] and the second: "Did Our Lady Merit the Divine Maternity Not Only *'De Congruo'* But Also *'De Condigno.'* "[43] In the latter article the author, who signs himself "B. A. of New Zealand," holds the less common opinion, namely, that Mary did merit the Divine Maternity *de condigno.* He bases his argument upon a general principle of St. Alphonsus and the teaching of the celebrated Jesuit theologian, Viva. In the *Glories of Mary* St. Alphonsus teaches, ". . . when an opinion tends in any way to honor the most most Blessed Virgin, when it has some foundation, and is not repugnant to the faith, nor to the decrees of the Church, nor to truth, the refusal to hold it, or to oppose it because the reverse may be true, shows little devotion to the Mother of God."[44] The author of the article in question then turns to the Jesuit, Viva, and gives a summary of his argument to show that Mary fulfilled all the requirements of condign merit with relation to the Divine Maternity. This is the foundation for his opinion demanded by St. Alphonsus.

An excellent treatment of the Virgin Birth of Christ from the pages of Tradition may be found in an article entitled: "The Doctrine of the Virginal Birth of Christ and Some of its Consequences," by the Rev. Vincent A. McCormick, S.J., of Woodstock College.[45] Fr. McCormick traces the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ through the writings of the Fathers of the Church and points out the fact that to the Virginal Birth as the direct and immediate cause must be attributed Christ's independence of the sin of Adam and from all the defects which are consequent upon the carnal generation from him. Fr. McCormick points out the inconsistency in many non-Catholic theologians who deny the Virginal Birth of Christ but hesitate to admit the consequence of such a position, namely, that the new Adam, in His human nature came under the influence of the first Adam's baneful curse.

Fr. McCormick's article should be read in conjunction with one by Fr. Humphrey Moynihan entitled: "The Virgin Birth of Our

[42] *AER,* LXXI, 6 (Dec. 1924), 572 ff.

[43] *AER,* LXVIII, 1 (Jan. 1923), 89 ff.

[44] *The Glories of Mary,* Part I, Ch. V, Sect. I (Ed. Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R. [Brooklyn: *The Redemptorist Fathers,* 1931], p. 158).

[45] *AER,* LXX, 5 (May, 1924), 492 ff.

Lord."[46] Whereas Fr. McCormick's article treats the question solely from the point of view of Tradition, Fr. Moynihan gives us an excellent treatment of the subject from a Scriptural standpoint. Fr. Moynihan uses in a masterful manner the very arguments of the "enlightened critics" as arguments *ad hominem* in his defense of the doctrine of Christ's Virginal Birth.

The question of Mary's increase of grace not only *ex opere operantis* but also *ex opere operato* finds expression in an article by Fr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., concerning our Blessed Lady and the reception of the sacraments. Fr. Connell, in his article entitled: "Our Lady and the Sacraments," [47] teaches that Mary certainly needed the *laver of regeneration* not, indeed, for the removal of original sin but for entrance into the Mystical Body of Christ and as the *Janua Sacramentorum.* In this teaching Fr. Valentine Schaaf agrees in his treatment of the question under "Was Our Lady Baptized?" [48] Fr. Connell also gives solid arguments for his teaching that Mary *very probably* received Holy Eucharist and Confirmation, that she *probably* received Extreme Unction, that she *certainly did not* receive Penance and Holy Order, and that she *very probably did not* receive the sacrament of Matrimony.

Writing under "Recent Dogmatic Theology" for the "Ecclesiastical Library Table" Fr. Connell treats the question at some length concerning the perfections and the limitations of Mary's infused knowledge.[49] Fr. Connell's remarks on this subject were occasioned by a very scholarly article entitled "Science de Marie" which appeared in the July and September, 1922, issues of the *Nouvelle revue théologique* under the authorship of Fr. Gererd. It is Fr. Gererd's teaching that the Blessed Virgin possessed infused knowledge in the strict sense *(scientia per se infusa)* from the beginning of her existence. This supernatural wisdom enabled her to remain in a state of continual intellectual activity, even during sleep, and thus enjoy the uninterrupted exercise of contemplation and divine love. Fr. Connell points out the fact that, although this teaching is opposed to the opinion of St. Thomas who held that

[46] *AER,* LI, 6 (Dec. 1914), 642 ff.
[47] *AER,* LXII, 5 (May, 1920), 532 ff.
[48] *AER,* XCI, 5 (Nov. 1934), 517 ff.
[49] *AER,* LXVIII, 1 (Jan. 1923), 89 ff.

Mary possessed only the scientia *per accidens infusa*,[50] many of the greatest saints and theologians of recent centuries—e.g. St. Bernadine of Siena, St. Francis de Sales, St. Alphonsus, Suarez, and Vasquez—have declared themselves in favor of this opinion, which, moreover, is substantiated by weighty theological arguments based principally on the pre-eminent sanctity of Mary. As to the extent of this knowledge even Fr. Gererd declares that it is difficult to make any save the most general statements. However, Fr. Connell maintains that we can safely hold that Mary was more enlightened about the truths of faith than even the Apostles and the greatest doctors of the Church. It is not probable, however, that she possessed a supernatural knowledge of speculative theology or the natural sciences.

"Studies and Conferences" in the February, 1934, issue of the *Review* offers a very interesting article under the title: "Where Did the Blessed Virgin Die" by the Rev. Andrew Neufeld, O.M.Cap.[51] In this article Fr. Neufeld points out the fact that there are two traditions claiming respectively Ephesus and Jerusalem as the place of her death and burial. The Tradition of Ephesus seems to be prior in time dating back to a passage in the synodal letter of the Council of Ephesus (431). Fr. Neufeld, however, points out the fact that the greatest argument against the tradition of Ephesus is the fact that St. John (who "took her to his own") did not go to Ephesus before the death of St. Paul, which occurred between 64 and 68. But, according to the best tradition, Mary was dead many years at that time: the year of her death being variously given as 42, 48, or 52.

Fr. Neufeld maintains, therefore, that the claim that Our Lady died and was buried at Jerusalem rests on a more solid basis than that of Ephesus. Apart from the Apocryphal works from the second to the fourth century—which indicate the existence of an early popular tradition—and the discovery of Mary's tomb in Gethsemane in the fifth century, we have an *a priori* argument taken from the words of Sacred Scripture. From the gospel testimony that "the disciple took her to his own" it seems logical to conclude that Mary's permanent residence after our Lord's Ascension into Heaven was with St. John at Jerusalem,

[50] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 3.

[51] *AER*, XC, 2 (Feb. 1934), 164 ff.

even though the latter was at times absent from the city on apostolic journeys, as may be seen from Acts 8:14 and 21:18. And if Mary thus dwelt permanently at Jerusalem, Fr. Neufeld concludes, it would further seem but natural to argue that she died there.

There have been many other excellent articles which we might mention as contributing to the study of Mariology which the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* over the years of its existence have offered to the student of theology.[52] We trust that when the *Review* celebrates the centenary of its endeavors to advance the study of sacred theology its pages will have furnished much additional material about the mysteries that surround and glorify the Blessed Mother of God.

LAWRENCE P. EVERETT, C.SS.R.

Mount Saint Alphonsus
Esopus, N. Y.

[52] Among these articles we might mention: "Our Lady in the Modern Age," by Stanley B. James, *AER*, C, 5 (May 1939), 409 ff; "Mary and the Church Militant," by Philipin de la Rivière and E. M. Shapcote, *AER*, XXXII, 2 (Feb. 1905), 113 ff; the marriage of Mary and Joseph contained in an article under the title: "St. Joseph," by Henry Woods, S.J., *AER*, LXXXVIII, 3 (Mar. 1933), 283 ff; "Mary, Mediatress of All Graces," by the Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., *AER*, XCIV, 5 (May, 1936), 456 ff.

SACERDOS ALTER CHRISTUS

That the life of a priest should, in its broader lines, be a reproduction of our Divine Master's career, is a truth too elementary for any one to gainsay. If ordinary Christians are bound, in the measure of their ability, to be followers of Christ and imitators of His virtues, the priest is unquestionably held to the practice of these virtues in so eminent a degree that he shall vindicate his claim to the glorious titles lavished upon him by Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the Church—"vicar of Christ, angel of the Lord, salt of the earth, shepherd of the fold, mediator between God and men, doorkeeper of Heaven, a terrestrial God, another Christ."

—Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., "Daily Meditation: the Priest's True Manna," *AER*, XII, 1 (Jan. 1895), 37 f.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE PRIEST IN THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

One of the oldest saws in the world is that used by mellowed pastors, religious superiors and retreat masters: "Human nature doesn't change." Neither do the problems of priests in their spiritual life. This is proved in a remarkable manner by a retrospective look over sixty years of articles on the spiritual life of the priest in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

In many instances, in fact, the material is so far from dated, so knowing, so effective, that we must bow in respect to those zealous priestly writers, and be conscious too that the American priest, no matter how isolated or lonely his apostolate, never lacked spiritual care.

HOLINESS

Naturally, a majority of the spiritual articles concerned holiness in the priesthood. For since the priest binds himself on the day of his ordination to be an *alter Christus,* holiness is necessary for him.

"They were giants in those days," we say as we survey the *Review's* finest group of articles on priestly holiness and the means to acquire it. The articles were written by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Kerby, former editor of the *Review.* These articles were later published in book form.[1] For over a period of fifteen years (1916-33) the gifted pen of Monsignor Kerby held Christ, the ideal Priest, before his priestly readers. With wonderful insight he described how the priest by faults of nature and of temperament falls far short of his ideal and gets in the way of his own spiritual progress and apostolate. He challenges the priest to examine his conscience. He urges the priest to acquire self-knowledge, a necessary means to eradicate the defects of nature and character that stunt spiritual growth. He complains, but without bitterness, against those who are satisfied with mediocrity and who measure their virtues by comparison with their fellow man. "The priest," he says, "who is not holy is unpriestly. God demands of him spiritual intelligence and joyous familiarity with

[1] *The Considerate Priest, Prophets of the Better Hope* (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1937).

spiritual realities."[2] Monsignor Kerby insists on self-denial, and, if it is necessary, even heroic self denial: "He [the priest] should look unfearing upon Christ and recoil from no demand the Divine Master places upon him."[3]

Fr. Heuser, the first editor of the *Review,* wrote a series of entertaining articles on clerical life, which were later published in book form. Although these highly amusing chapters are not of an ascetical character, nevertheless, many of them, like Msgr. Kerby's articles, bring the priest close to priestly ideals and help him to correct many minor faults that retard his spiritual progress.[4]

Fr. E. Mahoney writing from Ware, England, in 1925 and again in 1931 almost impatiently reminds the clergy of their obligation to be perfect. He deplores the term "secular clergy" and lauds the Americans for abandoning this misleading title for the more apt expression "pastoral clergy"! He strongly affirms that the priest should be more perfect than the simple religious. "To fulfill priestly functions properly there is required a degree of sanctity which does not compare, even faintly and remotely with the obligation arising from vows."[5]

An interesting series of three articles on the education of a priest appeared in 1939. They were originally notes taken from Archbishop Ireland's talks to his seminarians, delivered at St. Paul's Seminary in the last few years of the nineteenth century. They consider the priest as gentleman, scholar, and saint. The latter quality is singled out as the most important. "You must be gentlemanly and scholarly priests, but you must be more than that or all is lost. . . . Unless you are Christ's and filled with His spirit, thinking the same thoughts and actuated by the same motives, your ministry will be a failure."[6]

Sanctity is not obtained without vigorous mortification. The struggle against the lust of the world is forcefully presented by Fr. John A. O'Brien, who warns that there is no substitute for holiness in the priestly state.[7] "No amount of intellectual bril-

[2] *AER,* LXII, 1 (Jan. 1920), 23.
[3] *AER,* LXXIX, 5 (Nov. 1928), 517.
[4] H. S. Heuser, *The Archbishop's Pocketbook* (New York: Kenedy, 1928).
[5] *AER,* LXXII, 6 (June, 1925), 572.
[6] *AER,* CI, 6 (Dec. 1939), 503.
[7] This article appeared later as a chapter in his popular book, *The Priesthood in a Changing World* (New York: Kenedy, 1936).

liance, no charm of personality can substitute for sanctity in the life of a priest. If he lacks holiness of life, his ministry is without zeal or relish, hollow and empty, a mockery and a sham."[8]

It is evident from these few excerpts on sacerdotal sanctity that the writers and editors of the *Review* constantly kept before the eyes of the American clergy the obligation of holiness of life that is incumbent upon an *alter Christus* and which admits of no compromise. In recent years His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman echoed the traditional teaching of the Church, and we may add, of the *Review,* when he wrote: "The soul of the priest must be lined with the untarnished gold of personal holiness if worthily he is to live his life and meritoriously exercise his high office."[9]

THE EUCHARIST

The priest is the custodian of the Blessed Sacrament. His personal devotion to this sacrament of love is an altimeter to measure the heights of his spiritual life. The early issues of the *Review* made a special effort to promote this devotion among the clergy. Volume XI (July-Dec. 1894), in particular, gave much space to the Priests' Eucharistic League that was organized by Blessed Eymard, who died in 1869. The November issue was almost entirely devoted to the League and contained twelve selected articles explaining the League's history, purpose, progress, etc. "The principal object of the association," we are told, "is the promotion of devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament especially among the clergy."[10]

The inspiring articles in the November issue were no doubt instrumental in securing new members for the P.E.L., which in 1894 included about three hundred American priests. Over twenty five years later (1923) the *Review* contained an appeal for a stronger P.E.L. membership, lamenting that only about one-third of the American priests were enrolled.[11]

What influence did the P.E.L. exert in our country? We can measure some of its powerful influence from an article on the Eucharistic Congress of Chicago, which informs us that the Con-

[8] *AER,* XCIV, 2 (Feb. 1936), 124.
[9] *AER,* CXV, 5 (Nov. 1946), 321.
[10] *AER,* XI, 4 (Oct. 1894), 300.
[11] Cf. *AER,* LXVIII, 3 (March, 1923), 287.

gress "is due to past efforts to render devotion to the Blessed Sacrament popular in the United States, through the Priests' Eucharistic League and the means employed by it to propagate adoration to the Real Presence on our altars." [12]

The development of the P.E.L. in our country owes much to the efforts of the Most Reverend Camillus Maes, D.D., former Bishop of Covington. "For twenty years he was the zealous promoter of the Eucharistic movement in the United States and inspired the attending clergy with his intrepid faith and ardent devotion." [13] In the same year (1930) more than fifty percent of the clergy of North America were members of the P.E.L.

Besides the inspiring articles that were woven around the P.E.L., the American priest was from time to time reminded by the *Review* that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament is in a very special way a necessity for the personal sanctification of the priest.[14] In our time Fr. John Thilges, S.V.D., makes a strong appeal for Eucharistic visits. He explains the canonical obligation, the advantages of the practice, and various methods to make visits fruitful. "If we," he says, "learn to love Him whom we daily hold in our consecrated hands, and reserve in our tabernacles, our priestly life can hardly fail to become replete with His holiness, rich in merits and reward, and fruitful in apostolic labor."[15] Therefore, he exhorts the priest, "Since the Code prescribes a daily visit to the Blessed Sacrament as one of the means which the clergy should use to attain to perfection which is superior to the laity, it would be rash to neglect it." [16]

THE DAILY MASS

The most important daily action of the priest is to celebrate Holy Mass. Who can measure the abundance of grace that flows from the Divine Sacrifice and which determines to a great extent the personal sanctification of the priest and his people? Since the Mass is the central act of worship in the Church it is not surprising to find in the pages of the *Review* a great number of notes and ar-

[12] *AER*, LXXIV, 6 (June, 1926), 562.
[13] *AER*, LXXXIV, 1 (Jan. 1931), 5.
[14] Cf. *AER*, LVI, 5 (May 1917), 452.
[15] *AER*, CIV, 4 (April, 1941), 359.
[16] *AER*, CIV, 4 (April, 1941), 360.

ticles on the Mass. They treat of the doctrine, the liturgy, the canonical legislation and the methods of teaching and praying the Mass. We are interested here only in the devotional articles. Among such articles written in the early years of the *Review* two come from the facile pen of Fr. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C. Writing on the ceremonies of the Divine Sacrifice he appeals to priests to observe all the prescribed rubrics. "No priests," he says, "can celebrate with congruous impressiveness unless he accurately observes the little things of the rubrics." [17] In another article he asks why the faithful do not attend daily Mass. He finds the priest is not without fault.[18] "Regularity and punctuality on the part of the celebrant, then, are the primary requisites to the general practise, in any parish, of this devotion to the daily Mass."[19]

Why is it that the all-powerful Sacrifice does not transform the life of the priest? Rev. John K. Sharp, writing on ideals of the priest, gives one reason when he stresses the intimate relationship between daily Mass and meditation. These two go together. If the priest does not meditate, then he goes to the consecration of the Bread as to breakfast, and his Mass becomes "a mere function of office, in the cold propriety of formal robes, in swaying, unconnected manner, with mechanical, inconsequent voice and vacant eye and casual hand." [20]

A most interesting contribution on the priest and his daily Mass was written by the well-known Jesuit, Fr. Daniel McAstocker, in 1935. He writes with unction on the meaning and the benefits of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He was puzzled because some priests omitted daily Mass for slight reasons. "Honestly and conscientiously, I have been endeavoring to get at the root of our apathy in respect to the Holy Sacrifice, and I have finally concluded that we actually do not comprehend just what the Mass is." [21]

Fr. Gerald Ellard, S.J., an authority on the Mass and liturgical questions, gently chides the fathers who recite their Office while assisting at Mass. He asks: "Should priests pray the Mass?" He

[17] *AER,* X, 4 (April, 1894), 269.

[18] *AER,* XI, 4 (Oct. 1894), 271.

[19] Both these articles appeared later as chapters of the book, *Priestly Practice* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1914).

[20] *AER,* LXXX, 6 (June, 1929), 571.

[21] *AER,* XCIII, 5 (Nov. 1935), 514.

answers with another question: "Is it in any degree robbing the Sacrifice of Christ of some of its requisite sanctity, if priests pray their Office instead of praying the Mass?" [22]

MENTAL PRAYER

Readers of the *Review* back in 1895 were treated to a spirited article by Fr. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., on daily meditation. Fr. O'Neill, one of the most popular writers in the early years of the *Review,* convincingly demonstrated the necessity of daily meditation for every priest. The many articles on this subject that graced the pages of the *Review* in the succeeding years down to the present time have added little on the value and necessity of meditation that had not already been well said by Fr. O'Neill. Insisting that the priest must be an *alter Christus* he makes this bold but sound statement: "From Jesus Christ, who taught the priests of the first century, down to the least rigorous of the seminary rectors who are educating those of the twentieth, there has never been apostle, saint, Pope, father of the Church, doctor, theologian, or spiritual writer whose opinion carries the slightest weight, that has treated of the sacerdotal state without inculcating the urgent necessity of daily meditation on the part of the clergy." [23]

The different degrees of mental prayer and wise counsel on how to use methodical meditation was the subject of a paper by Fr. Godwin of Birmingham, England, who made it clear that the soul actually makes progress in prayer and that affective prayer succeeds discursive meditation. He condemns formalism in the use of meditation and tries to show how the missionary priest must meditate to keep his spiritual life alive midst his round of daily activities.[24]

Msgr. William J. Kerby in his many exhortations to the clergy gave much space to prayer and meditation. He refused to comment on the number of priests who neglected daily meditation, but suspecting that some might easily be discouraged he gave the following advice: "However, one who has convinced himself that he cannot meditate and finds no joy in his attempts to do so, while remaining faithful to the habit, maintains a true spiritual tradition

[22] *AER,* CXII, 2 (Feb. 1945), 105. [23] *AER,* XII, 1 (Jan. 1895), 39.
[24] Cf. *AER,* XXIX, 6 (Dec. 1903), 561.

and profits by it unconsciously. The time and the good will that are given to God are not given in vain." [25]

To those who are reluctant to see the dependence of the active apostolate on daily meditation, he says, "the desire of a priest to fit himself more perfectly every day for the service of souls should be revealed in the earnestness of his meditation and his eagerness to grow strong in Christ for the work of Christ." [26]

During the last twenty years American priests and theologians have shown a growing interest in the higher forms of prayer, especially infused contemplation. This trend stems from Europe where for the past fifty years there has been a revival of interest in the spiritual life. Hence, in 1942 we find an article on the priest and contemplation that might have startled the earlier readers of the *Review*. Fr. Thilges, S.V.D., asks the question: "Do our American priests have a real aptitude for, and interest in, contemplation? As experience proves, imperfect contemplation is by no means rare among fervent priests." [27] The author goes on to say that contemplation is helpful to the priest and will lead him to perfection. He insists that there would be more contemplation among diocesan priests if they removed three obstacles: venial sin, pride, and inordinate attachments. He exhorts the clergy to make an effort to be more contemplative for it will enkindle faith and love among our people.

THE DIVINE OFFICE

Some people wonder what the priest is doing when he says "his Office" in church or on the rectory grounds. Fr. Heuser explains the history, meaning, purpose, power and beauty of the Divine Office for them and the clergy in a series of charming and amusing articles that appeared especially in volumes LXIX and LXX of the *Review* under the title *Autobiography of an Old Breviary*. Their popularity induced the author to publish them together with other unpublished chapters in book form.[28] They have since been a guide and a light to the priest in his daily work of singing the praises of God.

[25] *AER*, XCIII, 4 (Oct. 1935), 360.

[26] *AER*, XCIII, 4 (Oct. 1935), 367.

[27] *AER*, CVI, 1 (Jan. 1942), 42.

[28] *Autobiography of an Old Breviary*, "Edited by the Rev. Herman J. Heuser, D.D." (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger, 1925).

A lively and profitable discussion on the recitation of the Divine Office in the life of the priest began in the September, 1932, issue of the *Review* and continued until August, 1933. The Most Reverend Bishop McDevitt, then Bishop of Harrisburg, began the discussion by placing the blame for poor recitation and lack of appreciation of the Office on insufficient study of the breviary in our seminaries. As a remedy he proposed the study of the breviary, missal, and ritual to begin in the first year of the preparatory seminary and to continue until ordination. As one would expect, certain seminary professors took issue with the Bishop. All admitted a real problem and proffered different solutions. One of the best articles of the discussion, which remained on a very charitable level throughout, was written by Fr. Louis Arand, S.S. The learned professor presented his views on the study of the breviary in the seminary and then gave his own solution:

> A priest with even a more imperfect knowledge of Latin than is possessed by most of our priests, without any special study of the Psalms, and without the classes and spiritual conferences on the Divine Office which are given in our seminaries, can with very little effort find in his daily recitation of the breviary an easy means of paying to God all his duties of religion and of imploring His help in all his necessities.[29]

Fr. Arand then goes on to select certain passages from the breviary to prove his point. The result is an excellent and convincing essay on how each one can make the breviary an easy and more efficacious way of prayer. He seems to have struck the real root of the problem when he says: "The priest who strives only to please God will have little difficulty saying Office well."

ANNUAL RETREAT

The annual clergy retreat is always a good subject for conversation. Some invariably find fault either with the retreat master or the retreatants. This critical attitude is not peculiar to the present generation of young priests. As early as 1902 an article "Father Mac on Retreats" appeared in the *Review* suggesting more comfort for the retreatants in their strange seminary quarters, and, what is more important, some relief from the gloomy conferences.

This highly amusing article was answered by Fr. Charles Coppens, S.J., who urged directors of retreats to know well the Exer-

[29] *AER*, LXXXVIII, 2 (Feb. 1933), 121.

cises of St. Ignatius, to avoid learned discussions which are boring, and to return to the simple meditations as proposed by the author of the Spiritual Exercises.[30] His own view is that ignorance of how to meditate is one reason why gloomy discourses have taken the place of meditations.

Some years later (May, 1918) Fr. John Talbot Smith proposed (one suspects at the instigation of the editor) the same subject for discussion in a highly critical article, "What's Wrong With Diocesan Retreats?" He places all the blame for the weariness, desolation and disappointment suffered by the clergy on the preacher. Why? Because the preacher has the wrong point of view. Since he feels that he is just one of the clergy he adopts a simple declarative style and suppresses his eloquence, figures of speech, rhetoric, feeling, elegance, and power. He sits when he should stand. His expression is formal, precise, correct, dull, and safe. Says Fr. Smith:

> In behalf of a few hundred priests of my own acquaintance, who must soon undergo the summer retreat, in behalf of the retreat preachers, who must now begin to train for that self-suppression which turns orators into dispensers of sleep, I appeal to whatever obstructive powers there be, that the preachers be ordered to speak standing, to use pose and gesture, to look what they feel and to feel all they can, to omit the apologetic and deprecatory, to hit straight from the shoulder, to use every quality and art they possess, to delight us with the human voice, to fill us with delight and envy and desire to equal their eloquence.[31]

Favorable and unfavorable comments were soon forthcoming. Fr. Clement Thuente, O.P., found Fr. Smith guilty of oratorical exaggeration.[32] Defending the retreat master whose first duty is to reconcile the retreatant with God, he says that oratory and entertainment are secondary and accidental. "J.D." in the same issue places the blame on the retreatants. Fr. Joseph Clancy, on the contrary, is inclined to agree with Fr. Smith, but adds that the underlying reason for the retreat master's failure is his inability to understand the secular priest to whom he preaches.[33]

[30] *AER*, XXVIII, 6 (June, 1903), 609.
[31] *AER*, LVIII, 5 (May, 1918), 529.
[32] Cf. *AER*, LVIII, 6 (June, 1918), 659.
[33] Cf. *AER*, LVIII, 6 (June, 1918), 665.

Needless to say agreement on what is wrong with diocesan retreats had not yet been reached. A step toward the solution was taken by Msgr. Kerby who explained many problems confronting the retreatant. In his usual brilliant style he insisted on keeping before the mind the deeper purpose of the retreat. "That purpose is to clarify spiritual vision, to improve self-knowledge and to strengthen the determination to live in Christ while doing the work of Christ." [34] Retreats fail for the following reasons: Retreatants are afraid of spiritual truth; they set out to get sermon material from a retreat conference; they have lost the habit of reflection, etc.[35]

Failure to observe silence has also been advanced as a cause for poor retreats. No one will deny the difficulty of observing silence at the annual retreat. Old friends meet again. The leisure hours offer a great opportunity and temptation to talk over old times. But how solve the problem? Fr. Clement Thuente, O.P., warns that there is no substitute for silence.[36] The social-reunion type of retreat must go. He is willing however, at the discretion of the Ordinary, to permit an hour's recreation after dinner and supper.

In its sixty years of existence the *Review* has given notable space to the subject of clergy retreats. Both retreat masters and retreatants have been taken to task. No doubt, both groups have benefited immensely. Yet, the complex question of what is wrong with diocesan retreats will remain for years to come an interesting subject for readers of the *Review*. The controversy in itself is a source of satisfaction. It is a healthy sign that priests realize the importance of the annual retreat as a means to higher sanctity.

CONCLUSION

This general survey of the spiritual life of the priest as portrayed in the sixty years of the *Review* is very incomplete. We must, for the sake of brevity, omit, among other subjects, spiritual reading and devotion to Mary in the priest's life. At the same time we do not wish to give the idea that priestly holiness and the means to attain it have been the sole or even the primary purpose of the *Review*. The *Review* is not professedly an ascetical periodical. It is engaged in clarifying the Church's legislation and in promoting

[34] *AER*, LXXIX, 1 (July, 1928), 24.
[35] Cf. *AER*, LXXIX, 1 (July, 1928), 24 ff.
[36] Cf. *AER*, LIV, 5 (May, 1916), 528.

the higher culture of the clergy. Yet, the editors are to be commended for having recognized the indispensable value of sanctity and the means to sanctity in the priest's quest for higher culture. It will be to the eternal glory of the editors and writers of the *Review* that they have always offered their readers sound spiritual doctrine and counsel capable of transforming them into other Christs. May the *Review,* under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, perfect the work it has so well begun!

KILIAN J. HEALY, O.CARM.

Whitefriars Hall
Washington, D. C.

THE PSALMS OF THE BREVIARY

Recalling [the Psalms] devoutly day by day, they become a rule of life, which creates dispositions and habits of mind in conformity with the life of Christ, the reality foreshadowed by David, and the pattern of the priest. They are thus not only a prayer but a sacramental fact. . . . Some of the Christian Fathers have called the Psalms the voice of the Church. In them she is at one time represented as clad in sackcloth and ashes, pouring out in company with her repentant children the doleful strains of the "Miserere." Again she walks with confident step, trusting in the mercies of the Most High, who will not desert her, "quia apud Dominum misericordia et apud eum copiosa redemptio." Then there are hours of longing after an increase of justice; even as the hart panteth after the living waters, so does the soul thirst after the love of God. And last of all she chants forth solemn songs of gratitude and joy, in the presence of the Ark of the Covenant; when the spouse bursts out in canticles of gladness, impatient to contain her joy since she has found Him whom her soul loveth. "These Psalms," says St. Ambrose, "are the prayer of the assembled Church, a profession of her faith, true and sincerest devotion, a chant of praise and joy. They subdue anger, are a relief in affliction. . . ."

—Anon. [Herman J. Heuser], "Life and the Psalms of the Breviary," *AER,* II, 1 (Jan. 1890), 2 f.

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW: 1889-1949

The leading article in the first issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* published in January, 1889, was entitled "Literature and the Clergy." The article was anonymous, but undoubtedly it came from the pen of Fr. Herman J. Heuser, Professor of Sacred Scripture at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, who was the first editor of the *Review* and for more than thirty years its guiding spirit. In this article the purpose of the newly established ecclesiastical periodical is clearly proposed—to help priests to become learned, and to help them to apply their learning effectively to the work of the sacred ministry:

> Let it be remembered that his [the priest's] first object is to sound truth, not to improve opportunities; that he is to be guided and to guide others by principles supernatural and eternal; that his views of right and wrong may never vary with the changing opinions and influences of the hour, but that he is to hold up truth in spite of such influences. . . . Nevertheless, this knowledge of the principles of things, however valuable and necessary it be, is not sufficient for the priest when he comes in direct contact with the world. . . . There are, in sooth, more things true than philosophical and theological principles, and one of these things is the fact that the main value of all principles lies in their actual application to men.

Evidently, the primary objective of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* as its first editor visualized it, was to promote efficiency in the practical field of the priestly life. Indeed, in this same article he asserted that "its province will be within the various branches of what has been aptly called *Pastoral Theology.*" However, the discussion of problems in speculative theology has never been regarded as alien to the scope of the *Review,* and down through the years many papers on this fascinating branch of the sacred sciences have been published in its columns. It is the purpose of this brief article to recall some of the more important and more interesting discussions in dogmatic theology that the *Review* has presented to its readers in the sixty years of its existence. Naturally, only a small proportion of all the articles in the field of dogma can be mentioned here.

The first lengthy treatment of a doctrinal subject in the pages of *AER* took the form of a book review. The book in question was *Les critères théologiques,* translated from the original Italian *I criteri teologici,* by Canon Salvatore Di Bartolo. The review was contributed by Msgr. J. Schroeder, first professor of dogmatic theology at The Catholic University of America. It appeared in the form of four articles between February and July, 1891, under the title "Theological Minimizing and its Latest Defender." The point in Di Bartolo's work to which Msgr. Schroeder objected most vigorously was the assertion that the infallibility of the Church does not extend to dogmatic facts—in other words, that the magisterium cannot define infallibly anything which is not found, either explicitly or implicitly, in revelation. Msgr. Schroeder justly contends that the Church can define infallibly, not only what is found in revelation, but also truths which are not revealed but are connected with revealed doctrine. These, he says, are to be believed *fide ecclesiastica* or *mediate divina.*

The discussion came to an abrupt conclusion in the July issue, even though Msgr. Schroeder had several more articles prepared. In May the Canon's book was placed on the Index, and Fr. Heuser deemed all further discussion unnecessary. In this connection Fr. Heuser took occasion to make a statement regarding the policy of the *Review,* which describes in a masterly fashion the loyalty to Catholic belief which should characterize all those who undertake the publication of a Catholic periodical:

> Whilst the *Review* represents no party in any of those things which admit of a liberal discussion or diversity of opinion, its boundary is unmistakably defined in matters of Catholic faith. Catholic faith means more than the exclusive adherence to the defined propositions of our creed. It implies a distinct loyalty, a natural attraction to the centre of authority in the Church, whence radiates the living force by which all parts are held together in perfect harmony. . . . Whenever any doctrine shows a tendency to deviate from this perfect line, whether within or without, whether by maximizing or by minimizing, it must arouse the suspicion of the thoughtful teacher of Catholic truth.

Sixty years ago, evolution was a favorite topic of debate, generally linked up with the name of Charles Darwin. Under the title "Darwinism and Theism," in the issue of September, 1892, Dr. Joseph Pohle, then teaching at The Catholic University of America,

took a remarkably broad view of the possibility of harmonizing the theory of evolution with Catholic belief. He asserted that, considered as a scientific hypothesis (as distinct from a philosophic system excluding a First Cause) Darwinism can not only be reconciled with Christianity, but is even quite compatible with the theological notions of the activity of the First Cause through the medium of secondary causes:

> The First Cause, the Creator, receives at the hands of Darwinism, not defeat, but greater lustre and glory, if the secondary causes are allowed to have as much share in the shaping and moulding of nature as they can afford of themselves. It is a principle of scholastic theology, distinctly laid down by Suarez, that God, the All-wise, should directly create only those things which but for Him could not possibly come into being, while all other things it is more becoming should have been produced by the secondary causes. Now, it is exactly the theory of organic evolution in general, and of Darwinism in particular, which acts up to this scholastic principle.

The entire issue of March, 1894, was taken up by five articles from the pen of Fr. John Zahm, C.S.C., under the general title of "The Mosaic Hexaemeron in the Light of Exegesis and Modern Science." He stated that St. Gregory of Nyssa was "the real originator of the nebular hypothesis that is so exclusively attributed to modern thinkers, especially Kant, Herschel and Laplace." Speaking of St. Augustine's commentary on the account of creation contained in Genesis, Fr. Zahm says: "Verily, in reading these words we can fancy that we are perusing some modern scientific treatise on cosmogony, instead of an exposition of Genesis written by a Father of the Church fifteen centuries ago."

Writing in the June, 1894, number, on "The Evolution Theory Applied to Man in the Light of the Vatican Council," Fr. Joseph Selinger narrates that in one of the chapters prepared for the Vatican Council, though not defined because of the abrupt termination of the Council, the theory of man's evolution was vaguely mentioned. However, he says, the general system of evolution (doubtless he means the theory of materialistic evolution) was condemned in the first chapter of the Dogmatic Constitution on Faith. His final conclusion is: "If science should ever discover incontrovertible evidence that man's body is the result of evolution from a lower organism, then the Church will determine the true sense of Scrip-

ture in this case, but until such time let the sense universally accepted as reasonable prevail."

The Bull *Apostolicae curae* of Pope Leo XIII, pronouncing Anglican orders invalid, issued on Sept. 13, 1896, was naturally of great interest in the theological world. The text of the Bull, with an English translation, appeared in the issue of November, 1896. Beginning in January, 1897, the *Review* carried an extensive commentary on this important document by Fr. S. M. Brandi, S.J., translated from the original Italian of the *Civiltà cattolica.* The author showed himself fully conversant with the doctrinal and historical problems involved in this official pronouncement. The series contained four lengthy articles.

One of the most interesting theological controversies carried in the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* began with an answer to a question in the September, 1897, issue, in which a very lenient and unusual view was stated in regard to children who die without baptism. The writer, who signed himself H.J.H. (evidently Fr. Heuser), committed himself to this statement:

> If, as some theologians teach, the Expiation of Christ had its direct effect upon all the departed souls, and if the unbaptized children become conscious after death that they possess a capacity for happiness which their necessary condition on earth prevented them from realizing and using, may we not assume that the longing excited by this knowledge will meet the mercy of Christ and bring them eventually to the fruition of His Expiation in the beatific vision?

In the December issue of that same year, Fr. James A. Grant of San Francisco opposed this view, and Fr. Heuser answered, again defending his lenient opinion: "Where baptism of water is a physical impossibility, a fore-denied conclusion, there we trust the mercy of God to make salvation possible in some other way devised by His omnipotence, and the possibility of a limbo where desire develops into conscious love is all we maintain, as not only consistent with Catholic doctrine but dictated by Christian charity."

The controversy continued into the following year, with two other writers, Fr. J. Nash and "Scholasticus" entering the lists. Finally, in June, 1898, the editor declared it ended, on the ground that "any further discussion could only involve a repetition of the old principles, or else drift us into criticism of individual opinions to which every one has his own right, even when they do not har-

monize with our own preconceived notions or the *dicta* of accredited theologians." Then Fr. Heuser added: "As to the position of H.J.H., outlined in his final 'Reply,' numerous expressions from capable sources have come forth to endorse it, siding with him all the more because the stand he took was particularly difficult owing to the generally accepted notions on the subject."

One of the most frequent contributors to *AER* was Fr. (later Bishop) Alexander MacDonald, whose first article appeared in the Conference section in February, 1899, and who continued to write for the *Review* for almost forty years. The Index for the first fifty volumes indicates the wide range of his interests. His articles or letters treat, among other topics, the assumption of the Blessed Virgin, the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, the Apostles' Creed (which, he contended, originated with the Apostles), the date of Christmas, the sacrament of Extreme Unction and the causality of the sacraments. His opinions, although at times they differed from those more commonly accepted by theologians and historians, were always defended in a scholarly and thorough manner.

The years immediately following the turn of the century constituted the period when Modernism was subtly attacking the most fundamental doctrine of Christianity. *The American Ecclesiastical Review* was not entirely free from this baneful influence. In the first decade of its existence it carried articles by Abbé Loisy and Fr. Tyrrell, S.J., who were later ranked among the leaders of the Modernists. In 1904 and 1906 lengthy book reviews praised Fr. Tyrrell's *Lex Orandi* and *Lex Credendi*. Of the latter the reviewer made this flattering comment: "One runs no risk of exaggeration—though he fall under the charge of enthusiasm—by asserting that the author of *Lex Orandi* has given to the general public no work that is at once so profound and so practical, so penetrating and withal so beautiful as *Lex Credendi*."

To the category of writings infected to some degree by the Modernistic ideas belong the series of articles by Bishop James Bellord, of England, concerning the nature of sacrifice in general and of the eucharistic sacrifice in particular, which appeared in the second volume of the *Review* for 1905. He placed the primary element of sacrifice in the eating of the victim, and consequently regarded the communion as the essential factor of the Mass. However, his death,

which occurred in the course of the same year, prevented the debate which certainly would have taken place.

In conjunction with the condemnation of Modernism by Pope Pius X in 1907, several articles of note appeared in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Worthy of special mention is a series of three scholarly articles by Fr. A. Viéban, S.S., contributed in the course of 1908 and 1909. Articles in November and December, 1908, by Bishop Charles Warren Currier, give an excellent summary of the incidents of the eventful year in connection with Modernism and its condemnation. He tells us: "The Board of Trustees of the Catholic University, at their meeting at Washington on 13 November, 1907, agreed in regarding 'Modernism' as a serious danger to the Church, and instructed Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the University and President of the Board of Trustees, to write a letter to the Sovereign Pontiff, declaring the adhesion of the University and its trustees to the Encyclical."

In the course of the next few years there were very few articles dealing with questions of speculative theology in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Whether this was due to editorial policy or to a hesitancy on the part of theologians to commit their views to writing, lest some taint of Modernism might seem to infect them, it is impossible to say. Bishop Alexander MacDonald debated the proof for Our Lady's Assumption with Fr. F. Holweck, and the nature of the Mass with Fr. (later Bishop) M. J. Gallagher. But the great majority of the articles were concerned with practical moral or pastoral problems, or with devotional subjects.

In the August, 1915, issue an interesting point was discussed by Fr. C. F. Cremin, of St. Paul's Seminary, under the title "Where Ecclesiastical Infallibility Resides." He presents this problem: "When the Fathers of a general council or the Pope alone as supreme head of the Church defines some doctrine, are we to look for the infallible sense of the definition solely to the objective formula as expressed in the document or rather, and more especially, to the sense of the dogma as entertained and intended to be expressed by the infallible authority responsible for the document?" Fr. Cremin himself upholds the view that the definition as conceived and intended by the magisterium is preserved from error, not merely the objective statement. After citing some particular examples from Trent and the Vatican Council to support this view, he adds: "If

these examples, which may be multiplied, tend to prove anything, they prove that the best criterion of what is infallibly true and of what sense is contained and unerringly propounded in a definition is the mind of the Pope when he speaks *ex cathedra,* and that the extent of the infallible guarantee of a definition is the intention of the Pope and the Fathers of the council."

In the issue for May, 1920, Fr. H. B. Loughnan, S.J., of Ireland, explained an opinion which was proposed by Cardinal Cienfuegos in the seventeenth century regarding the effects of Holy Communion. He believed that the soul of Christ remains in the soul of the communicant even after the distintegration of the sacred species and the departure of His body, and continues to remain as long as the communicant abstains from mortal sin. This view, the Cardinal contended, explains perfectly Our Lord's own promise: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." Fr. Loughnan proposes this view of Cardinal Cienfuegos, not as his personal opinion, but merely as "a piece of original thinking which met with the warm approval of many learned theologians."

Again, in the issue for June, 1922, Fr. Loughnan proposed another view defended by Cardinal Cienfuegos—namely, that "in the Blessed Sacrament Our Lord has a miraculous power, in virtue of which His eyes, though not spatially extended, really see, and His ears likewise really hear and His soul really loves because of what it thus sees and hears."

The monumental work *Mysterium fidei,* by Fr. M. de la Taille, S.J., with its definite views on the Holy Eucharist and the Mass, which appeared in 1921, afforded the occasion for much discussion among theologians. It was severely criticized by some, including Fr. A. Swaby, O.P., in the November, 1923, number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* The July and August, 1924, issues of the *Review* carried a lengthy defence by Fr. de la Taille, entitled "The Last Supper and Calvary: A Reply to Critics." Whatever his opponents may think of his theological theories, all must agree that Fr. de la Taille's plea for moderation and courtesy in theological debate expresses the true Catholic attitude:

> Theology requires above all things serenity of mind, peace, that beautiful peace for which a genius like St. Thomas is preëminently admirable. *Non in commotione Dominus.* It is no object of theology to raise

clouds of dust, but to let the calm light of heaven fall straight and pure on every part of the theological field, and penetrate and gladden even the darkest recesses of the mystic hall, where the queen of beauty, Beatrix, the soul that loveth God, through the earthly veil of words and images contemplates things unseen and things untold. To that let us aspire, rather than to the name of scholars or to the name of critics. In that let us unite, all in one and one in all; and let those who can, prove by the meekness of their spirit that they have understood best the Mystery of our Faith: the sacrifice of the gentle Lamb, that opened not His mouth on being led to the slaughter, and now on our altars lieth ever a peace-maker between heaven and earth—aye, and on earth too between the children of men—under the snowy pall of unleavened bread, with purple hues from the wine-press.

Writing in the March, 1925, issue on "The Mystical Body," Fr. H. G. Hughes, of England identifies the Mystical Body with the visible Church, though at the same time he refers to those actually outside the Church but joined to it by desire as belonging to the "soul." As is evident from the recent Encyclical of Pope Pius XII on the Mystical Body, this terminology should no longer be used. A more exact idea of the doctrine of the Mystical Body fully conformable to the Encyclical—though it appeared three years previously to the latter—was the article by Fr. Bluett, S.J., in the *Review* for 1940.

Beginning in February, 1926, and continuing more than a year in the columns of the *Review* was a discussion between Fr. J. Donovan, C.M., and Fr. V. Schaaf, O.F.M., concerning the validity of baptism conferred by non-Catholics. The former contended that Protestant baptisms are usually invalid, because of the lack of the proper intention, while the latter asserted that Fr. Donovan's arguments did not adequately prove this point, and that he was too ready to conclude the lack of a proper intention on the part of Protestants from the presence in their mind of an erroneous notion about the sacrament.

In May, 1930, Fr. M. D. Forrest, M.S.C., of England, wrote on the essential factors of the sacrament of Orders, contending that the whole essence of the sacramental rite of priestly ordination is found in the imposition of the bishop's hands with the prayer for the bestowal of the power and grace of the priesthood on the candidate. It is interesting to note that by virtue of the declaration of

Pope Pius XII, given in November, 1947, this is exactly what now constitutes the essence of ordination to the priesthood.

In "Transubstantiation and Modern Physics," appearing in the September, 1934, issue, Dr. W. O'Connor, of Dunwoodie, brings out the significant fact that modern scientists admit something beneath what appears to our senses—a background reality—and thus their theory of the composition of matter is nearer to the scholastic teaching on substance and accidents than was that of the former generation of scientists. Thus, the modern theories of the physicists do not clash with the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

In April, 1934, Fr. David Barry, of Ireland, discussed the question concerning the mode in which Our Lord exercises His priestly power in the Mass—whether we are to consider it as consisting merely in the fact that He established the Mass and the priesthood and commanded the repetition of the unbloody sacrifice in His name, or in the sense that He immediately co-operates toward the celebration of every individual Mass. Fr. Barry upheld the latter view.

The November, 1936, issue contains an article by Dr. Joseph Fenton, the present editor-in-chief of the *Review,* entitled "Help from the Holy Souls." Admitting that most modern authors regard it as a common doctrine that the souls in purgatory can and do pray for the members of the Church on earth, Dr. Fenton points out that the very opposite was taught by St. Thomas, on the score that the suffering souls are incapable of the causative activity of prayer.

In March, 1942, the subject of evolution, which had been treated so extensively in the early pages of the *Review,* appeared again in an article by Fr. W. A. Hauber, entitled "Evolution and Catholic Thought." His theme was that the doctrine of evolution can be held by a Christian if it includes the idea of God as conferring the vital force for lower forms to develop into higher. "The idea of a God-given tendency in matter to become more and more highly organized and the idea that the organization accounts for vital phenomena may be the way out for the mechanistic-vitalistic controversy."

Since January, 1944, *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has been under the management of the School of Sacred Theology of The Catholic University. In the course of these five years a large

number of articles on doctrinal subjects have appeared, but since most of those who will read this article have seen them, it is deemed unnecessary to recall them in this summary. The present editors believe that in the sixty years of its existence the *Review* has done much to maintain and to promote the interest of the American clergy in dogmatic theology, and they hope to continue this commendable tradition.

One of the features of the *Review* for many years was the annual or biannual article on "Recent Theology"—a summary presentation of the articles appearing in the theological periodicals throughout the world. This was suspended several years ago, because of the impossibility of obtaining most of the foreign periodicals on account of the World War. The editorial board is planning to resume this feature for the fields of theology and biblical studies in the near future.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

NAGASAKI, 1918

We visited the sites of the two martyrdoms of Nagasaki, when the Christians of Urakami, hundreds in number, were driven along the road where we walked, and with the Christians of Nagasaki were martyred on a hill overlooking the city and in view of the harbor. Both cities, within a hundred yards of each other, are natural amphitheatres for such a sacrifice. As we knelt and kissed the spot, and looked before us as the martyrs must have gazed from their crosses, the mountains to the West were dark and purple, and behind them an orange-red sun was dying. The city lay at our feet outlining the water's edge and seemed quiet from the distance; and the sails of the Japanese junks were resting unmoved by any breeze. It is hard to visualize the clamoring crowds that threw the martyrs' bodies over the cliff into the sea and Japan to-day seems never to have risen in wrath against the Church. Yet her persecution of today is as effective as the bloody wars of the past. Japan controls the minds of the growing youth, and Christian education has received a setback that is almost numbing.

—Francis Xavier Ford, "Maryknoll Mission Letters," *AER*, LX, 6 (June, 1919), 679.

CATECHETICS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

The pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* during the sixty years of its existence offer an excellent over-all view of the field of catechetics. This is in keeping with one of the primary purposes of the *Review* as envisioned by the editor in its initial number: "first of all, to be of help in carrying out the legislation of the Church and in particular, the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore . . . to aid teachers and assistant laborers in the vineyard of Christ." [1] The Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore issued several important decrees on catechetical instruction which presented anew the legislation of the Council of Trent and specified certain regulations for the Church in America. The Second Council (1866) considered at length the teaching of the Catechism in its legislation on parochial schools and on the necessity of religious education for all children, and it insisted upon the diligent exercise of this important duty on the part of those having the care of souls.[2] These provisions were amplified in the decrees of the Third Council (1884) to the effect that catechetical instruction of children incumbent upon pastors and their assistants must not be left entirely to religious or to the laity. This Council also decreed that pastors shall take special care of children, particularly by assiduously preparing them for reception of First Communion. They will see to it that these children receive instruction from the Catechism three times a week for at least six weeks before admitting them to the Holy Table for the first time.[3]

It was the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore which appointed a commission of bishops to prepare a catechism for official adoption, but their deliberations came to an end while the work was still under way, and in 1885 Archbishop (later Cardinal) Gibbons approved "A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, prepared and enjoined

[1] *AER*, I, 1 (Jan. 1889), 1.

[2] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II, Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1868), No. 435, pp. 222-25.

[3] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis III, Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1886), No. 217, pp. 118-19.

by order of the III Plenary Council of Baltimore." [4] That this new Catechism did not meet with immediate and universal approval can be gathered from numerous articles, letters, and reviews of catechetical texts based upon the Baltimore Catechism which appeared in the *Review* for a number of years. One writer felt very strongly that it was "faulty in many respects," but was still "the official catechism for the present." [5] Other authorities pointed out numerous pedagogical defects in the newly published text and voiced earnest hopes for its revision.[6] This revision, long awaited, was begun in 1935 under the direction of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and it was ready for use in three graded texts in 1941. The new Revised Baltimore Catechism, Numbers One and Two, was the result of the co-ordinated efforts of theologians, biblical scholars, and practical, experienced catechists. The Revised Baltimore Catechism Number Three recently published contains the same questions and answers as the Catechism Number Two, but it is supplemented and supported by material taken from the Scriptures and from authoritative teachings of the Church, with a particular view to meet today's problems of life and conduct. It is planned for use in high school and college classes, for teachers, and for adult education programs and convert classes.

PAPAL DOCUMENTS ON CATECHETICS

It has been the mind of the Church since the time of the Council of Jerusalem to evince her unceasing solicitude for the religious education of her children. The number of documents emanating from the Holy See on this important subject during the past fifty years surpasses any other period in the history of the Church.[7] Pope Leo XIII wrote two Letters which have an important place in the history of catechetical legislation. Vehement protests against the abolition of religious instruction in the schools of many European countries and explanation of the true notion of Christian edu-

[4] Raymond O'Brien, "The History of the English Catechism," *AER*, XCI, 6 (Dec. 1934), 596. Cf. also John K. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," *AER*, LXXXI, 6 (Dec. 1929), 575; LXXXIII, 6 (Dec. 1930), 620.

[5] *AER*, XIII, 5 (Nov. 1895), 384.

[6] *AER*, LXXVI, 6 (June, 1920), 651.

[7] C. E. Roy, *Organisation catéchistique* (Montreal, 1943), pp. 6 ff.

cation are found in the Letter of Leo XIII to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome on June 26, 1878. He also commended the work of lay organizations and confraternities devoted to catechetical instruction in a Letter to the Bishops of Bavaria and he urged the multiplication of all such societies in that country.[8] This zealous Pontiff wrote a Letter on Catechetical Instruction to the Cardinal President of the Catechetical Congress held at Piacenza in 1890 which is printed in full in the second volume of the *Review*.[9]

The development of catechetics in America owes much to the saintly Pope Pius X. A practical pastor and catechist before and after ascending the chair of Peter, he renewed the traditional laws of the Church on religious instruction, and it is due to his catechetical decrees that a world-wide revival of interest in teaching religion took place which was later ably carried out with vigor and vision by Pope Pius XI. From the active pen of Pius X came thirty-five documents directly bearing on the religious education of children and adults.[10] Chief among these are the famous Encyclical, *Acerbo nimis,* "On the Teaching of Christian Doctrine," which appeared on April 5, 1905 [11] and the Decrees on "The Daily Reception of the Holy Eucharist" [12] and "On the Age of Children who are to be admitted to First Communion." [13] Articles and letters published in the *Review* reflect the changes which these directives of the Holy See necessarily brought to catechetical instruction for adults and children throughout the Catholic world.

An article "On Teaching Catechism" gave the readers of the *Review* a practical commentary on the Encyclical *Acerbo nimis* of Pius X.[14] This epochal document was addressed to the bishops of the world and it promulgated anew for the universal Church the catechetical legislation of the Council of Trent and the various laws enunciated by the Holy See from Trent to the first years of the Pontificate of Pius X. The Pontiff deplores the sad condition of

[8] *Fontes iuris canonici,* III, No. 574, p. 116; No. 596, p. 269.

[9] *AER,* II, 2 (Feb. 1890), 139.

[10] Joseph B. Collins, *Catechetical Documents of Pope Pius X* (St. Anthony Guild, 1946), pp. LII-LXVII.

[11] *ASS,* XXXVII (1904-05), 613-25.

[12] *ASS,* XXXVIII (1905-06), 400-406.

[13] *AAS,* II (1910), 577-83.

[14] *AER,* XLVI, 6 (June, 1912), 656 ff.

human society and places the cause directly upon the prevailing ignorance of religion among all classes of people, young and old, cultured and un-lettered. The first part of the Encyclical considers the obligation to teach religion. This duty, the Pope proclaimed, rests primarily upon pastors of souls and he outlines the time and method of imparting catechetical instructions. The second part of the document points out in detail the important distinction between the sermon or homily and the simple explanation of the catechism to children and adults. The basic importance of catechetical instruction is treated in the third part of the Encyclical together with practical advice on how it is best carried out. Nowhere can one find better expressed than in the words of Pius X the humble dignity and value of the catechist and his work for souls. The document closes with legislation of a universal character to be observed throughout the world. These provisions, under six headings, are as follows: (1) The time and method of catechizing; (2) The preparation of children for reception of the Sacraments of Penance and Confirmation; (3) The preparation of children for First Communion; (4) The establishment of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in every parish; (5) Special schools in religion for youth attending public schools; (6) The time and manner of imparting instruction to adults.[15]

POPE PIUS XI AND CATECHETICS

The great work of Pius X in promoting religious education for young and old was augmented and emphasized by Pope Pius XI in a long series of documents which practically cover the entire field: courses in catechetics in the seminaries,[16] the place of religious in carrying out catechetical instructions,[17] the importance of religious education, and the exact status of this work in parochial and non-parochial schools throughout the world.[18] The most important document issued during the reign of Pius XI on catechetical instruction was the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council entitled *Provido sane consilio,* "On the Better Care and

[15] Cf. *Acerbo nimis,* "On the Teaching of the Catechism" (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1944).

[16] *AER,* LXXVI, 4 (April, 1927), 426.

[17] *AER,* LXIX, 3 (Sept. 1923), 272.

[18] *AER,* LXXII, 4 (April, 1924), 387.

Promotion of Catechetical Instruction," which was published Jan. 12, 1935.[19] An English translation of the text was printed in the *Review* during the same year.[20] This Decree had an immediate effect in stimulating catechetical activity in the United States and in giving impetus to the spread of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Here it is provided that "pastors and others having the care of souls should ever bear in mind that catechetical instruction is the foundation of the whole Christian life, and to its proper performance all their plans, studies, and efforts should be directed." [21] The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, set up and approved by Pope St. Pius V in 1571 and re-activated by Pius X, was ordered to be established in every parish in accord with the norms of canons 711, § 2 and 1333, § 1. A diocesan catechetical office was directed to be set up in every diocese, and an annual Catechetical Day or Feast of Christian Doctrine is to be celebrated with as much solemnity as possible. The document closes with an appended questionnaire which Pope Pius XI commands to be used by all bishops in submitting "an accurate report every five years to this same Sacred Congregation regarding catechetical instruction in their dioceses." [22]

CATECHETICAL TEXTS

The urgent appeals of the Popes and the decrees of provincial councils and synods during the latter half of the nineteenth century resulted in a general revival of interest in religious education, which in turn is reflected in the publication of a large number of catechisms and catechetical texts. A number of these volumes were based upon the Baltimore Catechism, such as Kinkead's *Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism,* which was planned for Sunday schools and advanced classes in religion.[23] Fr. Joseph DeHarbe's *Catechism of Christian Doctrine,* which traces its descent to the famous catechisms of St. Peter Canisius, attained a wide circulation not only in Germany but also in England and in this

[19] *AAS,* XXVII (1935), 145-54.

[20] *AER,* XCIII, 1 (July, 1935), 49.

[21] *On the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Instruction* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1946), p. 4.

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 23.

[23] *AER,* VI, 2 (Feb. 1892), 157.

country. The pioneer work of Rev. P. C. Yorke is of especial significance in the history of catechetics in the United States. Fr. Yorke succeeded in producing a graded course in Christian doctrine adapted to the age and mental capacity of children in the different grades of the elementary school. His *Textbooks of Religion for Parochial and Sunday Schools* appeared in 1898 and revised editions were published in 1927. Based upon the Baltimore Catechism, Fr. Yorke's manuals united in each lesson narrative (taken largely from his bible history), catechism questions and answers correlated with the explanation, and a hymn. This arrangement is found in many of our texts today.

The great contributions of Rev. Dr. Thomas Shields of The Catholic University of America to the teaching of religion has been pointed out in the pages of the *Review*.[24] His *Teacher's Manual of Primary Methods* and his graded series of "readers" appeared during the first and second decades of the present century and contributed to a reaction against parrot memorizing of the catechism lesson. The Shields technique presented abstract religious truths in attractive and concrete real-life situations, and also emphasized fully various forms of self-activity. One finds principles and methodology first enunciated by Dr. Shields which catechetical writers take for granted today.

The texts in religious education published by the Christian Brothers first appeared in 1910 and subsequent revisions have maintained a high degree of theological accuracy with solid pedagogical principles.[25] Honored recognition must be given, even in the present brief outline, to the Rev. Roderick MacEachen, a noted authority in the field of catechetics, for a graded course of "readers" which have prepared the way for the more complete series in use in our schools at the present time.[26] The demand on the part of catechists for examples and illustrative material was met by a new edition in 1908 of the well-known work of Rev. V. Chisholm, *The Catechism of Examples,* which first appeared in Scotland in 1886. This text was the first of a large number of works which served to make the teaching of religion easier and more effective.[27]

[24] "Dr. Shields' Catechetical Method," *AER,* XXXIX, 6 (Dec. 1908), 705.
[25] *AER,* LXXVI, 4 (April, 1927), 426.
[26] *AER,* LXIV, 1 (Jan. 1921), 11.
[27] *AER,* XL, 3 (March, 1909), 376.

A large number of catechisms and texts for classroom use have appeared during the past quarter century. Of greatest value is the *Catholic Catechism* by Cardinal Gasparri which includes texts of authoritative pronouncements in appendices in the complete single-volume English translation published in 1932. This work "for completeness and theological accuracy has taken its place among the best catechisms in history." [28] The Gasparri Catechism, graded in three parts, has been adapted for schoolroom use in a three volume series by Rev. Felix Kirsch and Sister M. Brendan.[29] Carefully planned catechisms based on the new Revised Baltimore Catechism No. 2 have appeared containing study aids and a variety of test exercises for pupil activity and class participation in the teaching procedure. Among these texts are those written by Fr. McGuire[30] and Ellamay Horan[31] for the Number Two Catechism, and there is an advanced Catechism of excellent merit by Fr. Connell.[32] Attractive and colorfully illustrated texts for children preparing for First Communion have also appeared since Fr. Kelly's *Our First Communion* and *Our Sacraments*.[33] Particularly popular have been Fr. Heeg's *Jesus and I* [34] and Sister Annunziata's *First Communion Catechism*,[35] and the writer's *Jesus Loves Children*.[36]

There has been an interesting development in reference texts and books on catechetical methodology during the past half century. *The Ministry of Catechizing* by the famed catechist-educator Bishop Dupanloup appeared in English translation in 1891 and was well received by critics writing in the *Review*. One writer compared its appearance in importance for teachers to the publica-

[28] Bandas, Baierl, Collins, *Religious Instruction and Education* (New York: Wagner, 1939), p. 23.

[29] *AER*, LXXXIV, 6 (June, 1931), 649; CI, 1 (July, 1939), 83.

[30] *The New Baltimore Catechism, Number One; Number Two* (New York: Benziger, 1941, 1944).

[31] *Baltimore Catechism, Number One; Number Two* (New York: Sadlier, 1941, 1944).

[32] *The New Baltimore Catechism No. 3* (New York: Benziger, 1943).

[33] Also *The Mass for Children* (New York: Benziger, 1935, 1937).

[34] Revised edition, 1942 (Loyola University Press).

[35] New York: Benziger, 1947.

[36] Milwaukee: Bruce, 1942.

tion of the Stonyhurst series in philosophy.[37] This great work of Dupanloup which presents the catechetical Method of St. Sulpice did not enjoy the popularity in this country that it deserves, although the Method it presents is admirably adapted to Sunday schools and to classes conducted by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine for children not attending Catholic schools.[38]

The Munich Method of catechizing, universally popular today at least with certain adaptations, was introduced to this country by articles published in the *Review* on the works of Rev. Dr. Stieglitz of Munich.[39] The comparatively wide use which the Munich Method enjoys is due in large measure to the books of Msgr. Joseph J. Baierl which are prefaced by a carefully written and complete explanation of the Method itself.[40] The first volume of his four-volume explanation of the Catechism appeared in 1919. Msgr. Schumacher's valuable *I Teach Catechism,* in three volumes, contains a complete explanation of the catechism with practical methods and exercises. This is a new revision of the author's popular *The Catechism Explained* which first appeared in 1935.[41]

Catechists seeking books dealing with general catechetical methods have Fr. John K. Sharp's *Aims and Methods in Teaching Religion,* and Bandas, Baierl, and Collins, *Religious Instruction and Education.*[42] Both general and special methods are exhaustively treated in Rev. Dr. Fuerst's *Systematic Teaching of Religion* and *Method and Matter in Teaching.*[43] Other books for teachers of religion by well-known authorities that have filled a long-felt

[37] *AER,* VI, 2 (Feb. 1892), 157.

[38] "Religious Instruction and Education," *op. cit.,* pp. 129-37. Cf. *AER,* XV, 4 (Oct. 1896), 374 ff., for an article by Rev. Michael J. Lavelle which advocates a program entirely based upon the Method of St. Sulpice as outlined by Bishop Dupanloup. Cf. also Joseph B. Collins, "The Method of St. Sulpice for Non-Parochial School Children," *AER,* XCIV, 6 (June, 1936), 572 ff.

[39] *AER,* XXXVIII, 3 (March, 1908), 341 ff.

[40] *The Creed Explained,* revised edition (St. Paul: Catechetical Guild, 1943); *The Commandments Explained,* revised edition (St. Paul: Catechetical Guild, 1946). Cf. *AER,* LXI, 4 (Oct. 1919), 460; LXVI, 5 (May, 1922), 534.

[41] Cf. *AER,* CXVI, 1 (Jan. 1947), 77.

[42] *AER,* C, 2 (Feb. 1939), 187.

[43] New York: Benziger, 1939, 1946.

want are Fr. McMahon's *Teaching to Think in Religion*[44] and Sister Rosalia's *Teaching Confraternity Classes.*

The fundamental change observable in catechetical texts and methods is due in part to the development of a definite science of education grounded on principles of psychology and on the character of the learning capacity of the growing child. Teaching techniques and tools found efficient in the various elementary and secondary school subjects have been utilized in teaching religion. Among these is the growing use of visual aids. A writer in the *Review* in 1910 deplored the lack of satisfactory pictures and stereopticon and lantern slides for Catholic catechists, and he praised the pioneer work of *Le Bonne Presse* in Paris for its efforts in this field.[45] Although mechanical progress has replaced these obsolete devices with the 35mm. slide film and the 16mm. silent and sound motion picture for educational purposes, the employment of films in teaching religion is still comparatively limited in extent. There is only one series of slide films illustrating the revised Baltimore Catechism available at the present time, and that is of recent date.[46] Similarly, with the exception of silent and sound films on the sacrifice of the Mass and on certain biblical stories, there is no 16mm. motion picture film bearing directly on catechetical subjects. Religious subjects in slide film are appearing in ever-increasing volume and the catechist at the present time should not lack material for teaching bible and church history, the Mass, and the Life of Christ.[47]

CONCLUSION

One can without too much qualification look back on the past half century of catechetics with a certain complacency. In the field of methodology and in the production of graded, well-illustrated texts much has been accomplished. It is a fairly universal practice to train religion teachers for their work and courses and institutes for this purpose are the rule rather than the exception. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, now almost universally established

[44] *AER,* CIV, 6 (June, 1941), 555.

[45] *AER,* XLII, 6 (June, 1910), 689-703.

[46] *The Visual Catechism* (Chicago: Society for Visual Education, 1947, 1949).

[47] *Catechetical Aids* (St. Paul: Catechetical Guild, 1949).

in our country, has embraced a wide field of catechetical work not only in its week-day classes for Catholic children and youth attending public schools and in religious vacation schools, but also through its parent-educator program for the preschool child and for directing parents how to teach religion in the home. This organization has a well-developed program of teacher training and a complete series of graded texts and supplementary material for every need. Its growth and activity in the United States since 1935 (with the establishment of the Episcopal Committee and the creation of the National Center at the N.C.W.C. in Washington) constitute a glowing chapter in the history of catechetics in this country.

The catechists of today have many advantages in texts and tools which were wholly lacking a half century ago. Their chief duty is to implant a knowledge of the faith so solidly that it will carry over into the daily life of today—a much greater task than that which faced the teachers of yesterday.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

DEVOTIONAL READING OF THE BIBLE

The devotional reading of the Sacred Books can hardly be called a study; it is rather the breathing of a heavenly atmosphere, a contemplation, a spontaneous opening of the soul to the light that comes from above. For the devout reader of the Bible there are no difficulties, no problems. . . . In the Sacred Book he simply sees God's word—"a letter," as the Fathers were wont to say, "addressed from heaven to earth," instructing him in what he most desires and needs to know; the end and the law of life, the true measure of all that is on earth and in heaven.

—John B. Hogan, S.S., "Clerical Studies," *AER,* VIII, 5 (May, 1898), 506 f.

A STATEMENT OF POLICY

The policy of any periodical publication is something comparatively easy to discern but tremendously difficult to define. It is readily discernible even in those magazines in which, as in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* a relatively small portion of the content is written by members of the staff or by regular contributors. A man who is familiar with any periodical comes to see, within a fairly short time, that there are certain objectives towards which that publication tends, certain points which it consistently stresses, certain opinions towards which it constantly exhibits a determined opposition. Thus he inevitably comes to distinguish some of the phases and at least the general direction of the magazine's policy.

Manifestly, then, any one of our brother priests who reads the *Review* at all frequently will necessarily come to recognize at least the broad outlines of the plan which guides the production of this periodical. He will see that this publication has sought to bring out God's revealed teaching on the nature and the necessity of that loyalty we owe to the true Church of Jesus Christ. He will appreciate the fact that the *Review* has worked to foster that enthusiastic and complete solidarity with Our Lord in His Church which the Holy Father loves to designate by the consecrated phrase, *sentire cum ecclesia.* He cannot help but note the fact that the *Review* has consistently stressed those divinely revealed truths which mark the Catholic Church alone as God's kingdom on earth during these days of the Christian Dispensation. Furthermore the priest who is well acquainted with the *Review* must have appreciated the fact that it has consistently opposed, in the case of any organization or activity (like the so-called "Springfield Plan"), those features or aspects or "principles" or implications which tend to represent the Catholic Church as a religious organization similar to others in this world.[1]

In the light of these and similar attitudes and emphases the general direction and the salient features of the *Review's* policy are readily apparent. The reasons which motivate and integrate this policy are by no means so easily ascertainable. Ultimately a man

[1] Cf. Dr. Benard's article, *The "Meaning" of the Springfield Plan, AER,* CXIV, 1 (Jan. 1946), 1-12.

must know something about the background and about the immediate purpose of the *Review* in order to understand why the magazine takes its own stand and stresses certain definite issues today.

The American Ecclesiastical Review was founded and is still intended to perform a definite and individual function in the field of Catholic literature. Actually its fundamental and essential work is quite distinct even from that of other periodicals directed primarily to priests in the United States. It would be erroneous to evaluate the *Review* merely as a Catholic magazine or merely as a periodical publication addressed primarily to the sacerdotal brotherhood in this country. It is a paper with a specifically distinct objective. Its policy is and must be consonant with its individual purpose.

This definitely does not mean that the individual and distinctive purpose of the *Review* is in any way more perfect or more necessary than the basic and distinctive functions of the other Catholic magazines written primarily for priests in America. Every one of these publications contributes magnificently, each in its own individual way, to the sublime work of priestly instruction and edification. Thus each works effectively towards the accomplishment of the purpose of the Church militant. Any glorification of one at the expense of another would constitute an inane hindrance to that sublime and salvific fraternal effort to which all are equally consecrated.

The distinct work the *Review* was founded to carry on within the Church is a special and highly important development of the task to which the first magazine for priests published in the United States was essentially devoted. *The Pastor,* edited by Fr. W. J. Wiseman of Cranford, New Jersey, and published by the famous Barclay Street house of Pustet, began in November, 1882. Fr. Wiseman intended this publication as a professional journal for priests and stated that he meant "only to gather up and to put into a convenient form for preservation in our libraries those bits and scraps of useful professional knowledge, some part of which we each light upon from time to time, but in a form that we cannot well preserve." [2] As a result *The Pastor* consisted, for the most part, of reprints of Roman documents of special interest to Ameri-

[2] Fr. Wiseman, in *The Pastor,* I, 1 (Nov. 1882), 4.

can priests. It also included answers to questions, discussions of cases in moral theology, and notices of books.

Fr. Wiseman did not limit his material to current pontifical documents. Among other things he printed the text of the letter *Quanta cura,* the statement to which the famous Syllabus of Errors had been attached, along with a translation and explanation. This letter had appeared in Dec. 1864. *The Pastor* insisted quite rightly that the prescriptions and teachings of this document were still valid in the "modern" world of the eighties.

The Pustet firm continued to publish *The Pastor* until the end of 1888. The first issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* came out in January 1889. Pustet was the publisher. Rev. Dr. Heuser made it plain that in some way at least the new magazine was a continuation of the old. After enumerating the various advantages of and reasons for Catholic literature for the clergy, he makes the following statement.

> It is from motives such as are suggested by the foregoing considerations that we have accepted the trust of editing the present *Review.* Circumstances make it necessary that, for a time at least, we pursue the limited lines originally suggested by the publishers of *The Pastor* for that Monthly. But in substituting the title of *American Ecclesiastical Review* for the former name, we desire to indicate the purpose we have in view, under the blessing of God and the co-operation of the ecclesiastical body in this country.[3]

The Pastor resumed publication in July, 1889. Fr. Wiseman continued as editor and the periodical had a business office in New York. It did not continue long since it was almost exclusively a one-man venture. The editor acknowledged that it had suspended publication from the end of 1888 until July, 1889, because he needed a rest. Even during these last days of the magazine, however, the editor considered it as the only professional journal for priests in the United States.[4]

Fr. Wiseman seems to have based this last statement on Dr. Heuser's intention to address *The American Ecclesiastical Review* "not only to the clergy, but to those, also, who more or less directly aid them in their sacred tasks, teachers, and assistant laborers in

[3] *AER,* I, 1 (Jan. 1889), 15.

[4] Cf. the advertisement for *The Pastor* printed on the cover of the July, 1889, issue.

the vineyard of Christ, whether they work in Church, or school, or in the world."[5] Despite the fact that Dr. Heuser believed himself compelled to follow for a time the lines originally laid down by the publishers of *The Pastor* for the older magazine, and despite the fact that the name of his periodical was substituted for that of its predecessor, his *Review* was never very similar to Fr. Wiseman's.

Dr. Heuser clearly stated the immediate purpose of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* in its very first issue.

> Our purpose, then, is, first of all, to be a help in carrying out the legislation of our holy Church, and, in particular, the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore. Our next object will be to strive for the promotion of what has been called the higher culture of the clergy. By calling attention to whatever may touch the special interests of the latter body, in the domain of ecclesiastical letters, or art, or science, it hopes to serve to the increase of knowledge unto sanctification. . . . Accordingly its province will be within the various branches of what has been aptly called *Pastoral Theology*. And whilst it proposes to keep alive, amidst the active ministry of the priesthood, a taste for and a habit of study, by recalling the teachings of the sacred disciplines, it will offer such information as is calculated to make the priest efficient, whether in church, or school, or the homes of his people, or the assemblies of strangers. The laws of the Church, as interpreted by her appointed guides, are to be our authority as well as our defence. The practice and approved teaching of holy men within her fold will be the pattern which we mean to propose for imitation. Polemics will not be a part of our programme.[6]

It was not long before Dr. Heuser felt himself obliged to make a definite announcement about one highly important phase of his magazine's policy. Then, as more recently, there were some individuals who seemed to believe that the columns of a periodical for priests should be open to more or less veiled criticism of the hierarchy or of other priests. Evidently the comments of these persons irritated the genial founder of the *Review*, for we find this characteristically forthright statement in the last issue of the *Review's* first year.

> It is surely an error to think that we could ever attempt to be a censurer of Bishops, for that were interfering with the Pope; nor to be a

---

[5] *AER, loc. cit.* [6] *Ibid.*

corrector of brother priests, since, where that is necessary, it is the business of the Bishops. If our authority offend, it may be that truth offends, and that those who demur have simply judged themselves.[7]

Although Dr. Heuser had stoutly declared that polemics would not be a part of the *Review's* program, the magazine very soon took a strong stand on two questions of interest and importance. Dr. Joseph Schroeder, one of the original members of the faculty of The Catholic University of America was asked for a criticism of Canon Bartolo's unfortunate book, *I criteri teologici.* Dr. Schroeder's articles were discontinued after notice of the book's condemnation in Rome had been received. In 1892 a series of articles controverting Dr. Bouquillon's stand on the hotly contested school issue appeared in the *Review.*

In explaining the discontinuance of Dr. Schroeder's writings against Canon Bartolo, Dr. Heuser set forth what has been, and what I hope always will be, the policy of the *Review* with reference to theological questions.

> Scientific criticism, if it has any legitimate purpose, is intended to call forth the free expression of different opinions. There can be nothing but gain resulting from this exercise. If, perchance, the opponents believe their views to be absolutely correct and to admit of no just alternative, it does not hinder the unprejudiced hearer from forming his judgment on the merits of the case as presented by both sides. A magazine, such as ours, should fail its object if it were wedded only to one set of otherwise legitimate views whether in the field of scientific or that of practical theology. We espouse no side in politics or "nationalism;" are pledged to no "party" in the social or ecclesiastical sphere, not even to a "school" in theology.[8]

The founder insisted, however, that this freedom of expression was very definitely limited. The magazine would admit no statement in any way subversive of the Catholic Faith itself.

> But whilst the "Review" represents no party in any of those things which admit of a liberal discussion or diversity of opinion, its boundary is unmistakably defined in matters of Catholic faith. Catholic faith means more than the exclusive adherence to the defined propositions of

---

[7] *AER,* I, 11 (Nov. and Dec. 1889), 403.

[8] From the article, "The 'Ecclesiastical Review' and Theological Discussions," in *AER,* V, 1 (Jan. 1891), 48.

our creed. It implies a distinct loyalty, a natural attraction to the centre of authority in the Church, whence radiates the living force by which all parts are held together in perfect harmony. This centre is immovable, and every portion of the circle which surrounds it owes its perfection and preservation to the conformity with which it yields to the centripetal law which controls its motion. Whenever any doctrine shows a tendency to deviate from this perfect line, whether within or without, whether by maximizing or by minimizing, it must arouse the suspicion of the thoughtful teacher of Catholic truth.[9]

Dr. Heuser went on to declare that "Among the methods by which to test whether a theological proposition is within the line of Catholic teaching and sentiment, there is none—apart from divine authority, and the traditional teaching of the Church—which has proved so sure and safe a means as the scholastic method of St. Thomas." [10] It was his contention that "If this method be applied as a touch-stone to the so-called scientific developments of philosophic or theologic thought, it will convert them, for the most part, into abstract principles which are inapplicable to the laws of revealed truth." [11]

The same article informs the reader that both Dr. Heuser and Dr. Schroeder were perfectly willing to publish any rejoinder which might have come from Canon Bartolo prior to the condemnation of his book. It concludes with the following observation.

But our disposition to publish the two sides of an argument which was then undecided, should never have extended to the assertion of anything in theology, or under the plea of scientific thought, which would offend, even by implication, against the respect due to the Vicar of Christ, or to the sacred deposit of Catholic Faith. We glory in the fact that we do not feel the least in harmony with that liberal school of theologians, who would sacrifice, without thought, the things God has placed in their trust to the circumstances of the times. In this field we shall ever hold on to the old dictum: Nil innovetur nisi quod traditum est.[12]

The first one hundred eleven volumes of the *Review* carried on their title pages the words "ut ecclesia aedificationem accipiat," [13] in the Latin or in the original Greek of the New Testament. In 1914, Mr. Edward Galbally, long the managing editor of this pub-

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 48 f.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 50.
[13] *I Cor.*, 14:5.

lication, wrote that "In that motto, as announced from the very beginning of the *Review,* is the end and aim, single and disinterested, of the founder of this magazine, its sole editor and conductor from that day to this." [14]

This motto expresses what was and what we hope ever will be the immediate and proper purpose of the *Review.* The magazine seeks to give to its readers those items of information and statements of truth which will be useful to American priests in doing the work of God in our time. It is precisely this aspect of utility which must stand as a norm in deciding what is to be the content of our magazine.

In other words, by its essential purpose, the *Review* must exclude certain otherwise highly valuable articles. Writings which deal, for example, with the interrelations of two somewhat obscure mediaeval philosophers are definitely worth while, but, since they convey no immediate advantage to priests as a group, they have no place in this publication. On the other hand, even those somewhat recondite articles which would aid priests in preaching about the dogmas of the Church are highly acceptable to the *Review.*

This same standard has always influenced the *Review* to disregard the attacks made against the Church by the professional Catholic-haters within the United States. Among the less valuable groups of our fellow citizens are certain publicity-loving individuals who can always be depended upon to bray and rant against every authoritative Catholic pronouncement. Occasionally some Catholic periodical will be found to devote some space to a "refutation" of these bigots. The *Review* has not followed this course. There is every reason for it to continue to refrain from such answers.

Actually the persons who have made a career out of vilifying the Catholic Church have placed themselves in the same position as the enemies who railed against Our Lord during the course of His public life on earth. Whether they advert to the fact or not, they have actually constituted themselves as θεομάχοι or fighters against God. The charges they hurl against the Church are not chosen because there is even the slightest evidence that they are true, but apparently only because these charges are calculated to express hatred of Our Lord's society and of its members.

[14] *AER,* L, 6 (June, 1914), 649.

When all the world can see the gold stars on the war honor rolls of the various Catholic parishes within the United States, there is no good reason to waste space in a magazine by elaborating a highly developed proof that Catholics can be good Americans, or, for that matter, a proof of the incontrovertible fact that they are far better Americans than these racketeers in the field of religion who devote their time and energy to the work of spreading dissension and discord within the nation. The task God has entrusted to a Catholic periodical, particularly to a periodical for priests, is something far more important. Hence *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has not carried and will not carry "replies" to men whose only claim to notoriety is to be found in the frequency and the vehemence of their outpourings against the Church of God.

The purpose of the *Review,* expressed in the old motto "ut ecclesia aedificationem accipiat," formulates the basic policy of this periodical in a negative way by excluding from its pages such material as is manifestly of no immediate use to priests in the tasks of the ministry. It also shapes this policy in a positive way by demanding the inclusion of those facts and appreciations which must enter into any effective and accurate presentation of the Christian message in our own times. The great doctrinal encyclicals of the Sovereign Pontiff and the urgent messages of our own American hierarchy constitute the best available norms for discerning the truths which Catholic teaching must stress here and now.

The editorial staff of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has tried to stress upon the pages of this publication those points upon which the Holy Father and the American hierarchy have most insisted in their messages to the faithful. We shall continue to do so as long as God permits us to remain in charge of this magazine.

If there is one aspect of life in Christ which the Holy Father and the divinely authorized rulers of the Church in our own land have emphasized most powerfully in their teachings, it is the doctrine of Catholic unity. Providentially this note has been sounded ever more urgently at a time when the forces arrayed against the Church have been concentrating upon the task of trying to separate the people of Christ from the leaders God has placed in charge of them. In order to show that all the resources of the *Review* must be consecrated to the furtherance of this unity, the board of editors has substituted for the original motto chosen by Dr. Heuser the

words from St. Paul's letter to the Philippians ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The purpose of the *Review* remains and will remain "ut ecclesia aedificationem accipiat." But, because this end is to be achieved only through work for the unity of the Church and of the Faith, work directed against the efforts of Christ's enemies, the *Review* works most immediately that we may stand "in uno spiritu unanimes collaborantes fidei evangelii." [15]

The men who work and write for the *Review* are well aware that the objectives for which it strives can and will be achieved through the powerful intercession of Our Lady. They realize that an ardent devotion to Mary on the part of our American priests will inevitably result in the successful accomplishment of those tasks to which God calls the Catholic Church of our country through the words of the Holy Father and of the American hierarchy. Therefore they have dedicated this magazine in a special way to the end of fostering an appreciation of and a love for the Blessed Mother.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[15] *Phil.*, 1:27.

THE CATHOLIC AND THE MODERNIST

For the Catholic, the Church and the Sacraments come from Christ Himself. For the Modernist, Christ never thought of establishing a Church or instituting any rites. These were called into existence by the needs of the early Christian community.

For the Catholic, the definitions of the Church are immutable, because they infallibly teach what God has revealed. For the Modernist, those definitions are only the expression of the religious experience of the Christian society at a given moment, and they must vary with new experiences and new mental conditions.

If one thing is certain, it is that a choice has to be made between these two concepts of the Catholic Faith. The issue is not "Modernism *versus* Scholasticism," but "Modernism *versus* Catholicism, Christianity and all Supernatural Religion."

—A. Viéban, S.S., "Who are the Modernists of the Encyclical," *AER*, XXXVIII, 5 (May, 1908), 508.

Answers to Questions

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Question: In the reply to a question appearing in the September, 1948, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* some quotations are given from literature issued by the National Conference of Christians and Jews which undoubtedly are out of harmony with Catholic principles. It may be of interest to your readers to learn that these passages no longer appear in the official publications of the organization. Indeed, it is the sincere desire of the officers of the National Conference of Christians and Jews to avoid in their publications all statements that would be out of harmony with the conscience of Catholics. Such being the case, would you be more lenient in your judgment regarding the affiliation of Catholics with this organization?

Answer: It is gratifying to learn that those who hold administrative posts in the National Conference of Christians and Jews are desirous of avoiding any statements that would be contrary to the religious principles held by Catholics. No one can doubt the sincere good will of these officials in their efforts to promote the spirit of friendliness and brotherhood among the citizens of various religious beliefs in our country. With this objective Catholics are in full agreement and sympathy.

However, I still believe—as I have often stated—that affiliation and participation on the part of Catholics in this organization are likely to endanger their faith gravely by leading them to think that religious differences are of little account. For example, the presence of a Catholic, a Protestant and a Jew on the same platform as representatives of their respective religions may undoubtedly incline some of the audience to believe that just as these individuals can meet as friends in a spirit of mutual tolerance and respect, so the different doctrines which they represent can be harmonized and reconciled by emphasizing the points of resemblance and abstracting from the points of divergence. In other words, there is danger that those attending such meetings may extend the principle of

personal tolerance (which Catholics hold) to the principle of *doctrinal* tolerance (which Catholics do not hold).

Furthermore, even in the current literature of the National Conference of Christians and Jews the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church is not adequately presented. Thus, in the pamphlet *Building Bridges,* published in 1948 by this organization, there is a summary of Catholic doctrine, in which the nearest approach to the doctrine of the necessity of the Church is the statement: "Whereas Christ meant His Church—the Catholic Church, in Catholic belief—to be for all men, He does not condemn those who in good faith do not recognize the Catholic Church as Christ's Church." Certainly this does not present clearly and unequivocally the Catholic doctrine that as a necessary means for salvation a person must belong either actually or in desire to the Catholic Church.

PUBLIC REFERENCES TO THE RHYTHM

Question: Is it permissible for a priest to speak publicly about the use of "Rhythm" or periodic continence? And, supposing the permissibility, to what extent may a priest refer to it?

Answer: The answer to this question depends in great measure on what is meant by "publicly." Certainly it would be wrong to discuss the use of Rhythm before a mixed gathering such as we have at a Sunday Mass—married and single, adults and children. However, before a homogeneous group of persons sufficiently mature to understand and to appreciate the treatment of this subject—particularly if they are persons who have or may soon have problems of conjugal life pertinent to the use of Rhythm—there would be no objection to a proper discussion of this subject. Nowadays this method of limiting births is often treated in books and pamphlets; and unfortunately, it is frequently proposed as "the Catholic method of birth control" so that the impression is given that the Catholic Church approves Rhythm without any qualification. This is a dangerous error, for although there are some diversities of view among theologians concerning the moral aspect of Rhythm, all are agreed that to use it without a justifying reason is wrong.

An example of persons before whom a clear and adequate pres-

entation of the Catholic attitude regarding Rhythm would be proper is a Cana or pre-Cana group, assembled primarily for the purpose of discussing problems pertinent to the conjugal state. Similarly, a class of college seniors to whom an instruction on marriage is being given could suitably be enlightened on this subject. And surely, it may be spoken of in the pre-nuptial instruction given to a couple or several couples, soon to enter the holy state of matrimony.

Naturally, the exposition of Rhythm given by a priest should be concerned with the moral rather than with the physical features of this system. No more of the physical aspect of Rhythm should be proposed than is necessary for the proper understanding of its ethical aspect. And the priest should never fail to emphasize the important Catholic principle that the primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and the proper rearing of children and that those who employ Rhythm merely to avoid the burdens of marriage while enjoying its advantages are acting in a manner very far removed from Catholic ideals of Christian marriage.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE STOLE PLACED ON THE CHILD IN BAPTISM

Question: When several infants are baptized together and one arrives at the point in the ceremonies for placing the end of the stole on the child, should this be done for each child individually or is it sufficient to place the end of the stole on only the first child?

Answer: The rubric of the Ritual directs the priest to place the left end of his stole only on the *first* infant, when several are baptized together. The rubric contemplates that the first part of the ceremony has taken place in the vestibule (narthex or porch) of the church. After certain interrogations, exorcisms, and prayers, the priest leads the procession of godparents, carrying the children, into the church, the stole on the leading infant drawing them, as it were, to the baptistery, as he says: *Ingredimini in templum Dei,* continuing towards the font reciting, together with the sponsors, the Creed and the Lord's prayer. There is no reason why each child should be touched with the stole when the ceremony of Baptism takes place in one spot, in the baptistery itself, as is the more usual custom in this country.

THE ASSISTANT PRIEST AND THE *PAX*

Question: At the first Solemn Mass of a newly-ordained priest, when an assistant priest in cope attends the celebrant, should the *Pax* be carried to those in choir by the subdeacon, as usual at Solemn Mass, or by the assistant priest, as is the rule at Pontifical Mass?

Answer: The assistant priest is always the minister to carry the *Pax,* whether the Mass is the Solemn Mass with a priest as celebrant or the Pontifical Mass of a bishop. After saying the *Agnus Dei* with the celebrant, the assistant priest and the deacon exchange places, the former going to the right and the latter to the left. The assistant priest genuflects, kisses the altar along with the celebrant, without placing his hands on it, and receives the *Pax.* Then he carries the kiss of peace to the clergy *in choro.* Returning to the altar, he gives the *Pax* to the deacon, who gives it to the subdeacon. Then the assistant priest resumes his place at the Missal, at the left of the celebrant.

This mode of procedure is that described in all standard books on ceremonial.

THE WAXED CLOTH ON A CONSECRATED ALTAR

Question: After the consecration of an altar, the *Pontificale* directs that a waxed cloth be placed on the altar before it is covered with the usual linens. Does this cloth always remain on the altar or is it proper only for the day of consecration?

Answer: The waxed cloth (Cere-Cloth or *Chrismale*) is required on the altar immediately after its consecration to protect the altar linens from being stained by the oils of the anointing and the ashes left by the wax crosses and incense, which are burnt towards the conclusion of the ceremony. When this practical use is over there is no further obligation of the Cere-Cloth. It may be retained under the three prescribed linens for some time after the consecration until the danger of staining these cloths has passed. The Cere-Cloth is simply a linen cloth, the size of the *mensa* of the altar, waxed on the lower side, where it comes in contact with the altar-table.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

Analecta

The proclamation of the observance of 1950 as a Jubilee Year was published by our Holy Father in the Apostolic Constitution *"Iubilaeum maximum"* issued on the Feast of the Ascension.[1] It exhorted the hierarchy and the clergy to stimulate the faithful under their charge to the fruitful observance of the Holy Year through the intensification of prayer and of the works of charity and penance. It expressed the hope that the faithful will make sacrifices in order to visit the Holy City during the Holy Year and that they will make the journey in the spirit of the pilgrims of the past who often went to Rome afoot to seek reconciliation with God. It granted a *toties quoties* plenary indulgence, applicable to oneself or to the faithful departed, for a visit to the four basilicas: St. John Lateran, St. Peter, St. Paul outside the Walls, and St. Mary Major. No special order is required in the making of the visits; moreover, they may be made on different days. At each visit the Creed must be recited, and the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, and the Gloria must be recited four times, once for the intention of the Pope. The intention of the Pope is set forth as inclusive of the following: the expiation of sins by all; loyalty to Christ and the Church; the preservation of the rights of the Church; the conversion of non-Catholics; the establishment of peace especially in Palestine; the pacification of the issues between capital and labor; social justice; fortitude for those who suffer for the faith; repatriation; consolation for the afflicted; the purity of youth; good example from their elders; and heavenly grace for all as an augury of eternal life.

On May 2[2] our Holy Father held a semi-public consistory declaring as worthy of canonization Blessed Bartholomea Capitanio, Vincenza Gerosa, Maria Joseph Rossello, Joan of Valois (Queen of France), and Joan de Lestonnac. At the same time he appointed the dates for the acts of their solemn canonization. The canonization of Blessed Joan de Lestonnac was set for May 15, 1949; that of Blessed Maria Joseph Rossello, for June 12, 1949; that of Blessed Bartholomea Capitanio and Vincenza Gerosa, for May 18, 1950; and that of Blessed Joan of Valois, for May 28, 1950.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLI (1949), 257. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

The acts of the solemn canonization of Blessed Joan de Lestonnac took place, as scheduled, on May 15.[3] Two days later[4] the Pontiff delivered an allocution to those who had come to Rome to participate in the solemnities of the canonization, pointing to the fact that Joan was reared in a household marked by a conflict in religious belief and showing the loyalty of Joan to the faith of her father in spite of the efforts of her mother, a sister of Michel de Montaigne, the noted essayist, to imbue her with Calvinistic principles. The allocution also emphasized the fact that the opposition of her father to her desire to enter the cloister and to pray and suffer for French society submerged in the morass of Calvinism was but the means of enabling her, through a long period of married life, to understand better the society for the reformation of which, through the education of its daughters, she was destined to found the institute of the Daughters of Notre Dame.

Ten days earlier, May 7,[5] our Holy Father had delivered an allocution to delegates of the International Union of Catholic Employers. In the allocution, our Holy Father insisted that employers and their employees are not irreconcilable enemies but that they are rather partners in a common undertaking. He said that in effect they eat at the same table, since their livelihood ultimately is derived from the gross or the net profits of the national economy. This view of their income, he averred, prevented the adoption of the concept that one is subordinated to the other. In the process of earning it, both contribute a service to the national economy; for in spite of the fact that the employer's books may carry the wages of his employees as expense items of his undertaking, they are in fact the expenditure of natural assets used for national production. Both parties, therefore, have an interest in assuring that the cost of national production shall be measured in proportion to the returns. In view of this mutuality of interest, it should be desirable to give employees a proportionate share of responsibility in the establishment and the development of national economy, especially at a time like the present when the scarcity of capital and difficulties affecting international exchange paralyze the sources supplying the means to meet the expenses of national production.

While nationalization of certain kinds of assets is desirable, i.e. those which cannot be left in the hands of individuals without en-

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 211. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 286. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

dangering the general welfare, to make nationalization the normal rule for the public organization of a national economy is to reverse the normal order which should be observed. For the object of public law is to serve the rights of individuals and not to absorb them. Economic interests are not a state institution; they are rather the living product of the free enterprise of individuals and of groups of individuals. Since these interests are not an object of public law, it is also false to assume that an economic enterprise involving either employer and employees, or only employees as co-proprietors, constitutes, of its very nature, a society in which all who participate in it have a right to share in the property or in its profits. A statute of public economic law is desirable by which the mutuality of interests would be recognized; but its purpose cannot be to absorb the private economic interests of individuals but only to determine juridical norms governing their interrelation.

Our Holy Father further stressed the greater responsibility of the employer to increase national assets through his savings but also affirmed that the employee must be given a wage that will enable him also to contribute to them in the same way. By approving the recommendation of his predecessor in favor of professional organizations of employers and employees in the various branches of production, he showed himself strongly in favor of the same policy.

He pointed to the hopelessness of plans that were contrary to the Catholic plan, while admitting that the working out of even the latter is not the task of a day.

Other allocutions were delivered by our Holy Father to the Ambassadors of Panama (May 6, 1949)[6] and of Bolivia (May 24, 1949).[7] In the former he praised the loyalty of the people of Panama to Christ and to the Holy See and commended their recognition of the fact that the nation's strength rested in the preservation of this fealty and the observance of the Christian virtues which it entailed. In the latter he noted with satisfaction that the new Ambassador was one who could be counted among those who understood the need of imbuing all the classes of society with a sense of religion and of moral responsibility as the only available means of alleviating the world's misery.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 218.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

In a radio message, dated May 15, 1949,[8] our Holy Father joined the people of Peru in their adoration of the Blessed Sacrament at the National Eucharistic Congress held in Cuzco, a spot renowned, as our Holy Father pointed out, for its monuments to Inca culture, a culture which was providential in the spread of the religion of Christ in Peru and the adjacent nations. In the message our Holy Father emphasized the doctrine that the Holy Eucharist not only confers and increases grace and charity, but is also charity in act. As such it is the Sacrament that best of all affords a remedy for the factional spirit that interposes itself between man and his fellow man, between man and authority, even the authority of God.

In a letter of Dec. 20, 1948,[9] our Holy Father replied to a letter of the German Hierarchy expressing their loyalty to him, a loyalty which he said was apparent in their visits *ad limina* throughout the year that had just passed. He expressed confidence that their zeal and diligence would be equal to the demands made on them by the efforts of the enemies of the Church, as well as by the chaotic economic and spiritual conditions existing in their country. He commended especially to their care their fellow citizens detained in prison camps as well as the displaced persons who had sought refuge in their country.

A letter of Feb. 20, 1949,[10] conveyed felicitations to Michael Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, on the attainment of his eightieth birthday anniversary.

A third letter, dated May 14, 1949,[11] was sent to Most Rev. René Joseph Piérard, Bishop of Châlons, to commemorate the eighth centenary of the consecration of the diocesan cathedral. In the letter our Holy Father noted that the observance of the centenary comes two years late as a result of the exigencies created by the war. He compared the vicissitudes of the twelfth century with those of the present, recalling that Pope Eugene III himself traveled to Châlons to consecrate the cathedral as a means of rallying the Christian princes to the banners of the crusade preached by his spiritual father, St. Bernard.

An Apostolic Constitution, dated Jan. 13, 1949,[12] established the Apostolic Prefecture of Tsiroanomandidy in the Island of Mada-

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 294.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 216.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 278.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 282.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

gascar from territory withdrawn from the Apostolic Vicariate of Miarinarivo.

A declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, dated Apr. 12, 1949,[13] stated that the faithful are forbidden, under the norm of can. 1399, 6°, to read the paper, *"Bilten,* Iniciativnega Sekretariata Duhovnikov Clanov of PRI IOOF Slovenije," published at Lubiana. The prohibition is explained as owing to the fact that the paper contains false doctrine, aims at undermining ecclesiastical discipline and insults the Catholic hierarchy.

The June number of the *Acta* publishes two documents from the year 1947. In one of these, dated June 13, 1947,[14] St. Anthony of Padua was constituted the Patron of the Apostolic Prefecture of Siangtan in China. The other, dated July 20, 1947,[15] records the acts of canonization of Blessed Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

Assistant at the Pontifical Throne:

Jan. 27, 1949: Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., Bishop of Kansas City.

Protonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium:

May 25, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas E. Horgan of the Diocese of Sacramento and James P. Murray of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

July 2, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William J. Schreck, Francis Kasprzak and Joseph Gambino of the Diocese of Buffalo.

July 16, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony Lotowycz of the Ruthenian Galician Exarchate.

Dec. 29, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Charles Gilmartin of the Diocese of Belleville; Joseph S. Pietrasik of the Diocese of Grand Rapids; and William J. Teurlings of the Diocese of Lafayette.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of Pius:

Jan. 20, 1949: Harold H. Tittmann.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 221. [14] *Ibid.*, p. 276. [15] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

Book Reviews

LITURGIA ROMANA. By Alexius Benigar, O.F.M. Two Vols.: Vol. I, pp. 406; Vol. II, pp. 417. Peiping, China: Domus Franciscana, 1947.

Out of the missionary land of China comes this comprehensive and scholarly work on the Liturgy. Its author, Fr. Alexius Benigar, is professor of liturgy in the regional seminary of Kiaokow, a suburb of Hankow, in the province of Hupeh. The publishing house is the Domus Franciscana, in Peiping, the Franciscan house of studies founded in 1934 by Fr. Schnusenberg as a language school for newly-arrived missionaries. It comprises also the Biblical Institute of Fr. Gabriele Allegra, which is now engaged on an edition in Chinese of the entire Bible. Domus Franciscana is the headquarters of the Delegate General of the Friars Minor and was moved to Hongkong before the Communist occupation of Peiping.

The more than eight hundred pages of the two volumes give an orderly and scientific presentation of the whole field of liturgy with special emphasis on its historical and theological aspects. It is not a ceremonial so there are no detailed instructions concerning the execution of public worship in accordance with liturgical protocol. Nor is it a practical analysis of the rubrics of Missal, Breviary, and Ritual so we find no treatment of complexity of commemorations or precedence of feasts. The first volume deals with the fundamental concepts of the official public worship of the Church, the idea of the Mystical Body, of Christ our Lord as the great *leitourgos,* and of the relation of the Holy Spirit to liturgical cult. Places of worship and the vestments and utensils employed in the conduct of it and a consideration of the structure of the ecclesiastical year complete the contents of the first volume. It is to be regretted that the date of publication of Fr. Benigar's book antedates by six months the appearance of the *Mediator Dei* of the present Holy Father, the text of which is so pertinent to the matter treated in the first third of this Chinese *Liturgia Romana.*

The second volume is devoted to the sacraments and sacramentals; the latreutic act *par excellence,* the holy sacrifice of the Mass; and the Divine Office. Here, again, the historical and the theological receive distinct treatment. For example, there is a comprehensive discussion of the general idea of sacrifice and its application to the Mass and a historical account of the development of the ceremonial of ordination and of the rites employed in the administration of the other sacraments. The index, occupying forty-three pages, enhances the practical value of

the work, presenting topics under several synonyms facilitating consultation, instead of multiplying cross-references. All in all, this product of a missionary country offers many features worthy of imitation in more favored lands.

Fr. Benigar's volumes are intended to take their place in a series of text-books designed for use in the major seminaries of China. Hence, as a very individual distinction, liturgical terms are repeated in Chinese characters. This reviewer is no expert in Sinology but a distinguished confrère of his has so explained the numerous ideographs which are inserted after the technical liturgical expressions to help Chinese students grasp their precise meaning and help them in presenting, in their vernacular, explanations within the understanding of the people. This will contribute much to the standardizing of these terms.

It is unfortunate that the poverty of China could furnish only a poor grade of paper for the printing of so excellent a treatise.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE LORD IS MY JOY. By Paul De Jaegher, S.J. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1949. Pp. 182. $2.50.

Amid the varied occupations of a missionary's life Fr. Jaegher has written this treatise with a view to showing the intimate relationship between holiness and happiness. His thesis is that the holiest soul is also the happiest soul, because the more faithful a soul is to grace and union with God, the more that soul shares in His holiness, His love, and His joy. He does not wish to convey the impression, however, that such a soul is secure from suffering. The spiritual life is not an uninterrupted series of delightful joys. It has a very painful side with its sufferings, troubles, and disappointments. Yet, the soul that has found the secret of how to love suffering comes to find real happiness in the very abnegation in which worldly people see practically nothing but pain.

This work is divided into four parts. The first part deals with God, the second with Jesus, the third with Mary and the Saints, and the fourth with the virtues. Written in a clear style, it should be quite understandable to the general reader, and should prove very helpful to spiritual directors who are striving to guide souls that have reached the life of union as well as souls that are making every effort to progress in the unitive way.

FRANCIS P. CASSIDY